Volume XXXVIII] *July, 1933* [*Number 4*

The

American Historical Review

PARLIAMENTARY CONFIRMATIONS OF THE GREAT CHARTER

"MAGNA CHARTA being confirmed thirty times, for so often have the Kings of England given their Royal Assents thereunto".[1] Thus Sir Edward Coke in the course of debates leading to the Petition of Right. In his *Second Institute* completed the same year, speaking of Magna Carta and the Forest Charter he says, "and the said two charters have been confirmed, established, and commanded to be put in execution by 32 several acts of parliament in all".[2] On the first page of this commentary (1797 edition) appears a parenthetical note listing statutes of confirmation by regnal years, as follows: for the reign of Henry III., one; Edward I., two; Edward III., fifteen; Richard II., eight; Henry IV., six; and Henry V., one.[3] Following the lead of Bémont or McKechnie (both of whom cite the 1797 edition) historians ever since have been content to follow this count, and have attributed it to Coke himself.[4]

[1] Rushworth, *Historical Collections*, I. 536. *Cf.* speech of March 22: "which Charter has been confirmed by good kings above thirty times", *ibid.*, 502.

[2] *Second Institute*, proeme. The full title is *The Second Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England*.

[3] *Ibid.*, I. 1. The note, in fine print, in parentheses, stands between the text of the preamble of the Charter, and Coke's commentary thereon, and reads as follows: "1 Inst. 81. Statutes of Confirmation. 52 H. 3. c. 5. 25 Ed. i. c. 1, 2, 3, & 4. 28 Ed. i. stat. 3. c. 1. 1 Ed. 3. stat. 2. c. 1. 2 Ed. 3. c. 1. 4 Ed. 3. c. 1. 5 Ed. 3. c. 1, 9. 10 Ed. 3. stat. 1. c. 1. 14 Ed. 3. stat. 1. c. 1. 15 Ed. 3. c. 1. 28 Ed. 3. c. 1. 31 Ed. 3. stat. 1. c. 1. 36 Ed. 3. c. 1. 37 Ed. 3. c. 1. 38 Ed. 3. stat. 1. c. 1. 42 Ed. 3. c. 1. 45 Ed. 3. c. 1. 50 Ed. 3. c. 2. 1 Rich. 2. c. 1. 2 Rich. 2. c. 1. 5 Rich. 2. c. 1. 6 Rich. 2. c. 1. 7 Rich. 2. c. 2. 8 Rich. 2. c. 1. 12 Rich. 2. c. 1. 1 Hen. 4. c. 1. 2 Hen. 4. c. 1. 4 Hen. 4. c. 1. 7 Hen. 4. c. 1. 9 Hen. 4. c. 1. 13 Hen. 4. c. 1. 1 Hen. 5. c. 1." There are actually only seven regnal years listed here for Richard II., but the *Statutes* contain two confirmations for 6 Rich. II.; thus eight are cited in the traditional list. See *Statutes of the Realm*, vol. II., index, for list of confirmations recorded there.

[4] William Sharp McKechnie, *Magna Carta*, p. 159; Charles Bémont, *Chartes des Libertés Anglaises*, pp. xlix–l; Charles Howard McIlwain, *High Court of Parliament*, p. 58; Albert Beebe White, *Making of the English Constitution*, p. 282, n. 1; W. E. Lunt, *History of England*, p. 149. George Burton Adams (*Constitutional History of England*,

Comparison with earlier editions of the *Second Institute* wherein no such list appears, upsets this tradition, and makes clear that this famous note was not Sir Edward's, but an editor's.[5] At no point in his commentary does Coke list entire his "32 acts of parliament", though he cites for special features, 52 Henry III., 25 and 28 Edward I., and 42 Edward III.[6]

It is a fair assumption that Sir Edward, the editor of the *Second Institute,* and the Record Commissioners followed the same method, and hence reached similar results: the method of listing as "statutes of confirmation" those to be found in the early printed editions of the statutes—the *Antiqua Statuta* and *Secunda Pars Veterum Statutorum.*[7] The main point to be made here is this: that, based as it is on the old printed statutes, the traditional list does not give a complete count of confirmations of the Great Charter. For the parliament rolls tell another story. Here are recorded for Edward III., seventeen confirmations; Richard II., twelve; Henry IV., six; Henry V., two; or a total of thirty-seven.[8] These, usually appearing on the roll as the first item of the *communes petitiones,* all receive some form of royal assent (conforming in the course of the fourteenth century to the customary *Le Roy le voet*). As the statutes contain confirmations for years in which none appears in the parliament rolls, and vice versa, the total number of recorded confirmations reaches forty-four, as against thirty (for Edward III. and

p. 142) and Thomas Pitt Taswell-Langmead (*English Constitutional History,* 6th ed., p. 116, n. 1) cite a confirmation for Henry VI. One is so listed in the index of the *Statutes* (vol. II.), but this 8 Hen. VI. c. 5 is not a general confirmation like the others, but a confirmation of statutes on weights and measures, of which Magna Carta is one. *Ibid.,* II. 241.

[5] See editions of 1642, 1671, 1681; also preface to the *First Institute* (1795 edition), in which the editors indicate that notes other than Coke's are to be distinguished by parentheses.

[6] *Second Institute,* proeme; *First Institute,* p. 81.

[7] For the basis of selection adopted by the Record Commissioners, see *Statutes,* I. xxxi-xxxiii. As to Coke, the commissioners say: "On a Comparison, made for the Purpose of ascertaining the Fact, there is reason to conclude that the Copy used by Lord Coke in his Second Institute was that of 1587 [Totell's edition]." *Ibid.,* I. xxii.

[8] *Rotuli Parliamentorum,* II. 7, 11, and 376, 128–130, 139, 227, 238, 259, 265, 269 and 272, 276, 285, 295, 304, 311, 318, 331, 364; III. 15, 42, 61, 80, 93, 115, 137, 146, 158, 173, 200, 221, 433, 468, 494, 591, 613, 659; IV. 19, 103.

For another (14 Ed. 3), a parliamentary petition not on the roll, see *Chartulary of Winchester Cathedral,* p. 131.

after) in the traditional list.[9] The printed statutes are based on the *statute* roll in preference to the *parliament* roll, but the former is not a complete or definitive record of the "approved bills" of a given Parliament.[10] Some rolls have been lost; others are scanty or imperfect—witness the parliament roll for the early part of Edward III.'s reign, and the deteriorated statute rolls of Henry VI.'s. Hence, even for years in which no confirmation is recorded, such negative evidence is not necessarily conclusive. In the fuller records of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, however, it is tempting to see a reflection of the constitutional vicissitudes of the age: the repeated confirmations of the troubled minority of Richard II. contrasted with the absence of such during the "good years" and subsequent tyranny; their revival under the parliamentary tutelage of Henry IV.'s reign; and final cessation in the selfish disorders of Lancaster and York.

The absence from the traditional list of any confirmations for the reign of Edward II. does not mean that there were none. Hemingburgh records one for the Easter Parliament of 1309[11] for which the roll yields

[9]

	Number of confirmations in parliament rolls	Number in statutes	Common to both	Total
Edward II.	17	15	9	23
Richard II.	12	8	7	13
Henry IV.	6	6	6	6
Henry V.	2	1	1	2
	37	30	22	44

[10] For new light on the character and relations of these two types of record, see Howard L. Gray, *The Influence of the Commons on Early Legislation* (Harvard Historical Studies, 1932), who shows: that the compiling of the parliament roll was a leisurely process completed after the end of a Parliament; that meanwhile the enactments were "edited" by the justices; that the compiler of the so-called "statute roll" did not get his material from the parliament roll, but from separate transcripts of these "edicted" enactments, commonly from the "original sheets directed to the sheriffs". As to why some of the approved bills recorded on the parliament roll did not become statutes while others did, he suggests that the distinction rested not on the importance of the act, but on whether it needed to be proclaimed—whether it was of general import or to be referred to the administrative department of the government; Parliament itself may have decided this point, or it may have rested with the justices (ch. XI.).

The petitions discussed in this article, it is interesting to note, usually appear as part of what Gray characterizes as a "comprehensive commons petition" (ch. VIII.) and contain phrases which he designates as the ear-mark of a commons' petition—*Prayen the commons*, etc. (ch. IV.).

[11] Anno Domini m.cccix. in quindena Paschae tenuit rex parliamentum suum Londoniis, et concesserunt sibi magnates xxv. denarium pro confirmatione Magnae Chartae et Chartae de Foresta, et . . . ." *Chronicon, Walteri de Hemingburgh*, Hans Claude Hamilton, ed., II. 275. But see also for this year the petition, *Rot. Parl.*, I., app., pp. 443–445.

but a few private petitions. The New Ordinances of 1311 contained as emphatic a confirmation of Magna Carta as can be found:

> That the Great Charter be kept in all its points in such manner, that if there be in the said Charter any point obscure or doubtful, it shall be declared by the said Ordainours, and others whom they will, for that purpose, call to them, when they shall see occasion and season during their power.

According to article xxxi, other good statutes were to be maintained "so that they be not contrary to the Great Charter nor the Charter of the Forest, nor against the Ordinances by us made"; while article xxxviii again confirmed the charters with a different proviso for interpretation.[12] The revocation of the Ordinances in 1322, of course, nullified their force as law (but the same was true of the famous 15 Edward III. which appears in the traditional list), but did not affect the status of the charters: "the Statutes and Establishments duly made by our Lord the King and his Ancestors, before the said Ordinances, abiding in their Force".[13] This Parliament, moreover, provided for certain enactments to replace the Ordinances, the first of which reads:

> Enprimes, Qe Seinte Eglise eit totes ses dreitures & franchises, sicome est contenue en la Grante Chartre, & autres Estatutz, de ceo fait avaunt ces houres.[14]

If the question be raised whether the Ordinances were the work of Parliament in the sense of a body composed of lords and commons, it may be said that while the Ordainers were appointed in a purely baronial assembly, commons were present in the assembly of August, 1311, to which the Ordinances were submitted, and in the assembly of 1322 which effected their repeal. Whatever status one accord the New Ordinances, they undoubtedly played no less a part in attempts to perpetuate the charters than did the confirmations of the next reign. Every attempt, 1311–1322, to enforce the Ordinances involved a tacit, and sometimes an explicit, demand for the charters. Supplementary articles issued some time between October, 1311, and January, 1312, asked that a certain measure be carried out according to Magna Carta and the Ordinances.[15] The

[12] *Statutes*, I. 158, 165, 167. The rejection of the *New Ordinances* as evidence in *Bate's Case* may have influenced contemporary and later writers against including them. See *State Trials*, II. 398, 497.

[13] *Ibid.*, I. 189.

[14] *Rot. Parl.*, vol. I., p. 456, no. 35.

[15] *Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis; Liber Albus, Liber Custumarum*, Henry Thomas Riley, ed., vol. II., pt. 2, p. 686; I. 302; *Annales London.*, pp. 198–202; *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1313–1318, p. 224.

spring Parliament of 1315, demanded a confirmation of the Ordinances and Magna Carta, and a perambulation of the forests. The Londoners, claiming their liberties as assured by Magna Carta, appealed to the Ordinances which had confirmed the latter. The York Parliament of 1318 was to treat of points relative to Magna Carta and the Ordinances, and the Charter was read before the group assigned to this work.[16]

> First, It is accorded, That the Great Charter, and the Charter of the Forest, and all other Statutes, made as well in the time of the King's Progenitors, as in the King's time that now is be kept and maintained in all Points.[17]

This, the typical "parliamentary" confirmation of the Charter, as it appears repeatedly in the statutes, makes a rather formalistic impression. Engrossed by the king's judges, the human interest element has disappeared. One must turn to the parliament rolls for a more lively picture. As recorded there, the requests for a confirmation pass through infinite variations, revealing a far from perfunctory interest in the famous document, and from time to time offering practical suggestions for its enforcement. It is instructive to correlate with these petitions contemporary references to specific provisions of the Charter. The present writer has found in printed fourteenth century sources appeals to at least twenty-two different provisions (some many times repeated). Such readily disprove the old view that the Charter early became obsolete, and that interest in its confirmation lay purely in the moral victory of reminding the king that he was under the law. But this discussion must be confined to the confirmations themselves. While no attempt will be made to describe the petitions individually, certain interesting variations may be noted.

The request for a confirmation of the Charter sometimes included, sometimes followed, a plea for observance of the "liberties of the Church".[18] It became increasingly the practice to include with Magna Carta measures covered vaguely by the phrase "other good statutes", or to specify particular acts. Of these last, the Forest Charter (inseparably connected in popular opinion with its famous compeer, ever since the issue of 1217) appears in every instance but one. Observance of statutes on purveyance was urged in petitions of 25 and 38 Edward III., and 4, 7, 8, and 10 Richard II.; statutes of laborers in 4 and 8 Richard II.[19] Particularly elaborate in its enumeration of other statutes was the petition of Richard II.:

[16] *Documents Illustrative of English History from the Records of the Queen's Remembrancer*, Henry Cole, ed., p. 12.

[17] 4 Ed. III. c. 1, *Statutes*, I, 261; *cf. ibid.* I, 345, 383; II. 32.

[18] *Cf. Rot. Parl.*, II. 7, and III. 15, for instance.

[19] 25 Ed. III., *Rot. Parl.*, II. 227, 238, 285; III. 93, 137, 173, 200, 221.

. . . qe la Grande Chartre, la Chartre de la Foreste, & les Estatutz queux sont ordeignez pur la Pees, & les Estatutz des Laborers & Artificers, & des Purveours, & l'Estatut des fauxes Acusours, & les autres Estatutz & bones Loies, faitz si bien en temps ñre Seigneur le Roi q'or est, come en temps de ses nobles Progenitours, soient bien tenuz & gardez en touz pointz, & duement executz.

In 1386 discontent with the administration brought a demand for the charters and other good statutes, especially those relating to sheriffs, undersheriffs, escheators, coroners, clerks of sheriffs, and purveyors. Occasionally other interests—rights and customs not embodied in statutes—received attention. The liberties of London and other towns were stressed in 1340, 1341, and 1376; and recurred constantly in a new formula of confirmation adopted in Henry IV.'s reign.[20] In the Parliament of 1379–1380, the Commons asked observance of the common law as it had been used in the time of the king's progenitors;[21] while in the troubled early years of Henry IV.'s reign, their plea was for peace and justice to poor and rich alike.[22] In some instances there was obviously little connection between the Great Charter and the "other good statutes" bracketed with it—such, for instance, as the *Statute of Laborers*. In such matters as the liberties of the Church, of London and other towns, and statutes on purveyance, related provisions in the Charter may well have been in mind. In fact, contemporary appeals to specific provisions of the Charter definitely indicate this to have been the case.

Why thus repeatedly confirm a document long established as part of the common law? McKechnie comments on the fact that "Parliament in 1369 thus sought to deprive future Parliaments of the power to effect any alterations upon the terms of Magna Carta. Yet, if Parliament in that year had the power to add anything, by a new legislative enactment, to the ancient binding force of the Great Charter, it follows that succeeding Parliaments, in possession of equal powers, might readily undo by a second statute what the earlier statute had sought to effect."[23] But that was not the medieval conception. To add something "by a new legislative enactment, to the ancient binding force of the Great Charter" was what fourteenth century Parliaments sought repeatedly to do. The

[20] *Statutes*, I. 281; *Rot. Parl.*, vol. II., p. 129, no. 20, p. 331. The parliament rolls contain no confirmation for 1340, but see *Chartulary of Winchester Cathedral*, p. 131, petitions which, the editor believes, were the parliamentary petitions which formed the basis for the statutes of 1340. See below, p. 672.

[21] *Rot. Parl.*, III. 80.

[22] "Et qe touz voz liges & subgitz purront fraunchement & pesiblement, & en seure & sauf protection du Roy, aler & venir a voz Courtes, pur pursuir les Loies, ou les defendre, sanz destourbance ou impediment de nully. Et qe pleine Justice & Droit soient faitz si bien as poveres come as riches en voz Courtz." *Ibid.*, III. 468. *Cf.* similar petitions, pp. 433, 491.

[23] McKechnie, p. 159.

perennial medieval problem of law enforcement was at bottom. Formal recognition by the king and his officials, together with the attendant publicity, was valuable, and particularly so in the case of Magna Carta, the Forest Charter, and such statutes as those on purveyance. Against these, king and officials were apt to be the chief offenders. During the thirteenth century publicity for the Charters had been secured by reading in county courts and cathedral churches. Enforcement had been attempted by the state through the ordinary courts, or some special group temporarily constituted "preservers of the liberties";[24] and by the Church through the great excommunication. In the fourteenth century similar devices were proposed, but more and more Parliament becomes the focal center for their operation. The Commons ask reading, not in county court or cathedral church, but before the whole Parliament; interpretation, not by a baronial committee, but in Parliament, or by the council reporting to Parliament; enforcement, not by groups of local commissioners, but by the peers in Parliament. Certain provisions of the Charter could be handled in the appropriate feudal or royal court—the individual offender who placed weirs in the Thames, the feudal overlord who denied a widow her marriage portion, the merchant who used false measures. That the Charter was common law, thus enforceable in the courts had been recognized in the *Confirmatio Cartarum*. With the enforcement of provisions designed to restrict king and administration, it was a different matter. One could not deal in the courts with a ruler who recorded through commissioners the alleged crimes of a vassal, ignoring the right to trial by peers; who winked at abuses committed by his purveyors, or encroached upon the liberties of holy Church.

Edward II.'s reign forms a transition period for these practices as it did for Parliament itself. The New Ordinances provided first (article vi) for interpretation of obscure points by the Ordainers and those whom they chose to consult; and then (article xxxviii of the completed ordinances) "that the Points which are doubtful in the said Charters of Franchises be explained, in the next Parliament after this, by the advice of the Baronage, and of the Justices, and of other Sage Persons of the Law".[25] The method prescribed by articles xl-xli for enforcing the Ordinances indirectly related to the charters too. Officials[26] were to take

[24] Such as the council of fifteen set up by the *Provisions of Oxford*, and the commissioners provided by the *Articuli super Cartas*.

[25] *Statutes*, I. 167.

[26] The list specifies chancellor, treasurer, chief justices of the two benches, chancellor of the exchequer, treasurer of the wardrobe, steward of the king's household, all justices, sheriffs, escheators, constables, holders of inquests for all purposes, and all other royal bailiffs and officials.

an oath to keep the Ordinances. In each Parliament a committee composed of one bishop, two earls, and two barons was to be assigned to hear and determine complaints against any official false to his oath, penalties to be imposed at the discretion of the committee. Already in 1309, an attempt had been made to buy observance of the charters. Hemingburgh stresses this element of the bargain: "concesserunt sibi magnates xxv. denarium pro confirmatione Magnae Chartae et Chartae de Foresta . . . ". Similarly the New Ordinances and the charters which they confirmed were bought with a twentieth by the Parliament of 1315.[27] The practice was not new as far as the charters were concerned, for such transactions had taken place for the issue of 1225, the confirmations of 1237, 1297, and 1300. But by the fourteenth century the feudal "gracious aid" had become the parliamentary tax on moveables, and bargaining for redress of grievances took the form of the parliamentary grant on conditions. We shall find the idea that a confirmation was purchased by parliamentary grant emphasized in 1340, and it may well have been present in popular conception on many other occasions.

In Edward III.'s first Parliament appeared a petition asking interpretation of the Great Charter;[28] while the confirmation of 1334 was followed by a proviso that "such statutes as be obscure by good advice shall be made plain".[29] The unusual grant of the ninth sheaf, fleece, and lamb, in 1340, was made in return for important concessions, not the least of which was a confirmation of the charters. This is one of the few confirmations recorded by several chroniclers, all of whom note the bargain element.[30] The spring Parliament of 1341 reminded the king of this grant, reproaching him with his failure to fulfill its conditions, especially in regard to the charters.[31] Most elaborate were the proposals put forth by clergy, magnates, and commons in this assembly. For this was the Parliament in which Archbishop Stratford led the opposition to Edward's measures designed to punish an administration which had failed to support adequately his French campaign. The king's alleged violation of liberties of the Church through special taxation and purvey-

[27] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1313–1318*, p. 224.

[28] *Rot. Parl.*, II. 7 (the text is imperfect).

[29] The roll for this Parliament has been lost. A summary made by Robert Bowyer (late Elizabeth or early James I.) reads: "It was enacted, That the Great Charter, of the Forest, [*sic*] and other Statutes should be observed; and that such Statutes as be obscure, by good advice shall be made plain." *Rot. Parl.*, II. 376 (appendix).

[30] Hemingburgh, *Chronicon*, II. 354–355; *Eulogium Historiarum*, Frank Scott Haydon, ed., III. 204; *Anonimalle Chronicle*, V. H. Galbraith, ed., St. Mary's Abbey, York, p. 16.

[31] *Rot. Parl.*, II. 128.

ance, his arrest and imprisonment of clerk and layman, methods of the commissioners sent to check up on tax collectors and other officials—all these touched "liberties" embodied in clauses of the Great Charter, and consciously associated with it at this time. Edward evaded the demand of the prelates that the Charter be read, a special oath sworn for its maintenance, and penalties "point by point" imposed on local officials for non-observance.[32] In spite of the king, however, other petitions took form in the famous (but short-lived) statute 15 Edward III. Here is a clear-cut attempt to entrust the guardianship of the Charter, not to a baronial committee as in 1258, not to a small committee of five in Parliament as in 1311, but to all the peers in Parliament.[33] The oath to be exacted of the king's officials, is, of course, reminiscent of the scheme of the Ordainers.

With Edward's anullment of the statute, no such "king-yoking" schemes were adopted until the minority of Richard II., but from time to time the Commons offered more modest suggestions to secure enforcement of the Great Charter and "other good statutes". Their petition of 25 Edward III., asking that "Punissement de corps soit ordeigne a ses qe fount la encountre", met with but vague response. Reading of Magna Carta and the Forest Charter was demanded in 1354, while in 1363 officials were to be charged with examining and showing to the council statutes and ordinances not duly executed.[34] Petitions of 29 and 38 Edward III. sought remedy through writs granted by the chancellor,[35] not a new practice, for it was sanctioned by the statute of Marl-

[32] *Ibid.*, vol. II., p. 129, no. 20; p. 130, no. 28.

[33] "And if any thing be from henceforth made against the Great Charter, and the Charter of the Forest it shall be declared in the next Parliament, and by the Peers of the Realm it shall be duly redressed. And if any, of what [Estate or] Condition he be, do any thing to the contrary, (he) shall stand to the judgment of the Peers in the next Parliament, and so from Parliament to Parliament, as well of franchises used, as of them which shall be now granted. . . .

"And if any Minister of the King, or other Person, of what condition he be, do or come against any point of the Great Charter, or other Statutes, or the Laws of the Land, he shall answer in the Parliament as well at the King's Suit, as at the Suit of the Party, where no remedy nor punishment was ordained before this time, as far forth where it was done by Commission or Commandment of the King, as of his own authority. . . ." *Statutes*, I. 295–296.

[34] ". . . & qe ceux qe sont a l'encontraire soient puniz selonc la quantite de Trepas." *Rot. Parl.*, II. 227, 259, 276.

[35] " . . . come diverses meschiefs & duretes avoignent de jour en autre a la dite Commune, de ceo qe diverses pointz de la Grande Chartre, & la Chartre des Forestes, ne sont mye tenuz; Qe pleise a ñre dit Seigñr le Roi & son Conseil d'ordiner, qe les dites Chartres soient tenues en touz pointz; et en cas qe defaute ou mesprision soit en nul point, qe le Chaunceller grante Brief de remedie faire sur les ditz Estatutz, quant mestier y serra. Soit fait." *Ibid.* II. 265. For the similar petition, 38 Ed. 3, *ibid.*, II. 285.

borough. Special efforts to secure publicity and enforcement were put forth in Richard II.'s troubled minority. In his first Parliament the Commons asked that the Great Charter be read "point by point" before prelates, lords, and all the baronage, and commons; any points found obscure were to be declared between this Parliament and the next by members of the continual council, in consultation with justices, serjeants, and any others they chose to summon. The resultant interpretation was to be shown to Lords and Commons at the next Parliament, and "adonqes estre encresceez & affermez pur Estatut s'il semble a eux q'il soit a faire . . .". Both parliament roll and statutes state that the Charter was read in Parliament.[36] The wording of this petition is particularly effective. The king is reminded of his coronation oath: "eiant regarde coment le Roi est chargee a son Coronement de tenir & garder la dite Chartre en touz ses pointz", an interesting expansion of the oath to cover something it did not specifically contain. In quite the tone of American writers who extol the "fathers of the constitution" the petitioners revert to the genesis of the Charter: "eiant regarde a la grante nobley & la sage descression q'estoit en la Roialme quant la dite Grande Chartre estoit ordene & establiz."[37] From this time on the petitions become more perfunctory and contain fewer variations.

The practice of excommunicating violators of the charters, or rather of pronouncing a general sentence of excommunication to be incurred *ipso facto* by all who should infringe them thereafter, had been used throughout the thirteenth century. The impressive ceremony, performed as it was "with bells ringing and candles burning", must have added something to the reputation of the charters, which alone among state documents were accorded such a dignity. Yet the efficacy of this weapon as a preventive or penalty was always doubtful. It was a failure as far as the king was concerned. Henry III. had been supported by papal bulls forbidding the clergy to excommunicate him or his officials. In the course of the fourteenth century respect for the Church and its anathemas diminished. The Avignonese papacy, Wyclif and his poor priests, Friar Tuck and his like, the very overuse of the power of excommunication itself—all played a part. The clergy themselves, however, kept faith in the great excommunication, and continued to employ it

[36] *Rot. Parl.*, III. 15; *Statutes*, II. 1. The Charter was read by the chancellor before some of the prelates and lords at Northampton, 1380, while waiting for others to arrive. *Rot. Parl.*, III. 88.

[37] The same idea appears in one of the 1341 petitons: ". . . la Grande Chartre faitz par les nobles Rois & ses Progenitours, & les Grantz du Roialme sages & nobles adonqes Pieres de la terre, & puis sovent confermez de divers Rois". *Ibid.*, II. 128, no. 9.

from time to time against violators of the charters.[38] Hence we find the Commons, by whose inspiration we cannot tell, resorting to warnings in their petitions, lest any become liable to this curse. In 1368, for instance, they asked repeal of statutes contrary to Magna Carta, the Forest Charter, and others, "pur la profit de la dite Comune, & pur la graunde sentence eschure q'est contenu en les Chartres & Estatutz susditz".[39] In the Good Parliament the Commons asked a confirmation, "a l'honour de Dieu & de vostr' Roial Majeste, & salvation de tout la Roialme, & pur eschuire les grosses sentences qe chaient sur touz ceux qi fount au contraire . . . ".[40]

Much has been made of one in this succession of confirmations, that of 42 Edward III.: "That the Great Charter and the Charter of the Forest be holden and kept in all Points; and if any Statute be made to the contrary that shall be holden for none." [41] Coke believed that this act restored the Great Charter to its full effect and pristine vigor. His conception of the document was pithily embodied in the oft-quoted "*Magna Charta* is such a Fellow, that he will have no Sovereign".[42] Francis Bacon, like Coke, believed that the Charter was fundamental and unalterable. Amongst modern writers, McIlwain, with his thesis of the predominantly judicial character of medieval Parliaments, and the accompanying conception of fundamental law, accepts this view of the Charter; while McKechnie points out its conflict with the theory of parliamentary sovereignty.[43] Another shows that, in practice, fourteenth century lawyers did not treat the Charter as unalterable fundamental law. While he finds in the act of 42 Edward III. words, "which at first sight suggest that this document was meant to be regarded thence-

[38] See for instance, David Wilkins's *Concilia Magnae Britanniae*, II. 414; *Cal. of Plea and Memoranda Rolls of the City of London, 1323–1364*, A. H. Thomas, ed., p. 84; Hemingburgh, II. 375–380 (the sentence pronounced by Stratford, 1340–1341).

[39] *Rot. Parl.*, II. 295.

[40] *Ibid.*, II. 331. *Cf.* a passage in a petition and its resultant statute (on the removal of obstructions from rivers) as late as 1472, "uppon which Magna Carta, a grete sentence Appostelik of excommengement by grete nombre of Bishoppes ayenst the brekers therof was pronounced, and the same sentence, iiii tymes in the yere opynly is declared, accordyng to the lawe of the Chirch". *Ibid.*, VI. 158–159, and *Statutes*, II. 439. But this was not a petition for confirmation.

[41] *Statutes*, I. 388.

[42] "But this writ [*de odio et atia*] was taken away by a later statute, viz. in 28 E. 3. because as some pretended, it became unnecessary . . . but within 12 years after this statute, it was enacted, as often hath been said, that all statutes made against *Magna Charta* (as the said act of 28 E. 3. was) should be voyd, whereby the writs of *odio et atia, et ponendo in balium* are revived, and so in like cases upon all the branches of *Magna Charta*." *Second Institute*, I. 42; Rushworth, I. 562.

[43] See quotation, McIlwain, pp. 64–65. For the views mentioned, *ibid.*, pp. 51–66, 99; McKechnie, p. 159.

forward as fundamental . . . investigation makes it difficult to believe that this was the true meaning of the confirmation. Although *Magna Carta* was thus confirmed in general terms, considerable portions of it had long been repealed by previous enactments. Were these repeals still valid after 1368? The lawyers showed no doubts whatever and regarded the repeals as still operative."[44] But consistency was not a virtue of fourteenth century Parliaments and courts. There were "considerable portions" of the Charter not yet repealed. Its fame as a distinct entity was too great for anything but a confirmation *in toto*. Interpretation of obscure points had been asked and sometimes attempted. Change through interpretation was under way in both courts and Parliament,[45] but that did not, in contemporary opinion, detract from the fundamental quality of the document interpreted. 42 Edward III. was only an emphatic statement of what was a constant factor in popular opinion throughout the fourteenth century, and implied in all confirmations. As a matter of fact, the *petition* of 42 Edward III. goes further than the *statute*. Not content simply to assume that statutes contrary to the charters "be holden for none", it asks that such statutes be examined, and "par la sage discretion & avisement des Seigñrs de Parlement" actually repealed.[46] It was dangerous to leave on the statute roll acts which contravened the charters, and might well be enforced by the judges as law of the land. There is here a suggestion of the increasing importance of parliamentary authority in legislation, a hint of that coming sovereignty of Parliament which would ultimately contest the force of fundamental law. After 1368, no petition for a confirmation asked repeal of contrary statutes, but for a few years, 42 Edward III. is echoed in such phraseology as that of 1376:

> qe la Graunde Chartre, & cele de Forest avaunt ditz, ove touz lour articles, estoisent en lour plenere force, nientcontreesteant auscun Estatut, Ordinance, ou Chartre depuis faitz ou grauntez a l'encountre.

This formula was practically repeated in petitions of 1376–1377, and

[44] Theodore F. T. Plucknett, *Statutes and their Interpretation in the First Half of the Fourteenth Century*, p. 27.

[45] A petition of the Easter Parliament, 1341, seems to imply that change effected by the peers in Parliament was permissable, for reference is made to the Great Charter and other statutes, "perpetuelment a durer, sanz estre enfreintz sinoun par acorde et assent des Pieres de la terre, & ce en pleyn Parlement". *Rot. Parl.*, II. 128, no. 9. See Lapsley's comment thereon, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXX. 204.

[46] *Cf.* an interesting individual petition of 18 Ed. II., which reminds king and council that the Charter carried in its text a promise of its inviolability. *Rot. Parl.*, I. 419; *ibid.*, II. 295.

1379.[47] Commons, as well as popes and kings, could make use of *non obstante* clauses.

Why do these parliamentary confirmations of the Great Charter gradually become more perfunctory, intermittent, and finally cease altogether? M. Bémont attributes the obscurity of the famous document to the rise of the Tudor absolutism.[48] Before this, however, its decline becomes apparent in the disuse of certain provisions, and the fact that others were superseded by detailed statutes of much greater practical value. Among the latter may be reckoned acts on purveyance, weights and measures, obstructions in rivers, etc. Again it is instructive to correlate with the confirmations, appeals to specific provisions of the Charter. Of these the present writer has found in the period 1307–1377 reference to at least twenty-two different articles; in Richard II.'s reign, to five; and in the whole Lancastrian period, to seven. Well before the triumph of Tudor absolutism, a transition period (Richard II. to Henry VI.) is interestingly reflected in the very form of confirmations themselves. In Richard II.'s reign, for the first time appear confirmations of statutes, with no mention of the charters.[49] But it is the Shrewsbury Parliament, that foretaste of absolutism, that initiates a new formula:

> First, That Holy Church, and the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and all Cities and Boroughs and other Commonalties of the Realm, have and enjoy their Liberties and Franchises from henceforth, as they have reasonably had and enjoyed in Time of his noble Progenitors Kings of England and in his Time.[50]

New, yes, as a form of confirmation, but not new *per se,* for it was used by Richard's chancellors in their opening speeches to Parliament.[51] On only two occasions, and those in the reign of Henry IV., is it recorded that a chancellor included the charters amongst the promised liberties: Archbishop Arundel in 1407, and Thomas Beaufort in 1411.[52] In the

[47] *Rot. Parl.*, II. 331, 364; III. 61. [48] Bémont, p. l.

[49] *Statutes*, II. 38, 78; *Rot. Parl.*, III. 210, 290, 318. 3 Rich. II. (*Rot. Parl.*, III. 80) includes the charters, but the corresponding entry in the *Statutes*, II. 13, does not.

[50] *Statutes*, II. 94.

[51] *Rot. Parl.*, III. 257, 277, 284, 309. For the early part of Edward III.'s reign the rolls give only brief notice of the chancellor's speech (*les causes del Somons de cest Parlement*). Following the first attempt at quotation (1354) more and more space is devoted to the speech. Hence we are not in a position to know whether the chancellor ever promised the Charters in the earlier period when they were more in demand.

[52] *Rot. Parl.*, III. 608, 647. Beaufort uses quite the language of the earlier confirmations: "qe'y feust la voluntee du Roy, qe Seinte Esglise ait & enjoie toutz ses Libertee [*sic*] & Fraunchises, & qe la graunde Chartre & Chartre de la Foreste, & toutz autres Estatutz & Ordinances faites devaunt ces heures, & nient repellez, soient tenuz & gardez, & mys en due execution".

first Parliament of Henry IV. the Shrewsbury formula was replaced by the older type of confirmation, but with Henry's second Parliament the first stage in the transition is complete. Succeeding confirmations, with the exception of 4 Henry V., combine a request for the various class liberties as promised by the chancellor, with the old demand for the charters and other good statutes:

> First, That Holy Church have all her Liberties and Franchises; and that the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and all the Cities, Boroughs, and Towns franchised, have and enjoy all their Liberties and Franchises, which they have had of the Grant of the Progenitors of our said Lord the King, Kings of England, and of the Confirmation of the same our Lord the King; and that the Great Charter, and the Charter of the Forest, and all the good Ordinances and Statutes made in the Time of our said Lord the King, and in the Time of his Progenitors, not repealed, be firmly holden and kept.[53]

According to the rolls, chancellors continued to promise the "liberties" to Parliament after Parliament through 1417, and occasionally thereafter through 1435.[54] For a time, the Commons followed the chancellor's lead, with never a reference to the Great Charter.[55] After 1423, their common petitions cease to be headed by requests for a confirmation of any sort.

In the troubled days of Lancaster and York, there ceased to be any unanimity of feeling or coöperation in action such as was, if not constantly, at least periodically reflected in the *communitas regni* (or *universitas regni*) of earlier days. Similarly the great document which had held some interest for each of the diverse elements of the *communitas* and united them in its support, was abandoned in favor of the several liberties and franchises of "Holy Church, and the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and all Cities and Boroughs and other Commonalties of the Realm". Before this consummation was reached, however, Parliament had become the guardian of the Charter and of its "great idea" that the king is under the law. In the fourteenth and early fifteenth century records of Parliament was to be found the material which enabled its seventeenth century successors so successfully to turn the medieval class liberties of the Great Charter into "liberty of the subject".

FAITH THOMPSON.

The University of Minnesota.

[53] 4 Hen. IV., *Statutes*, II. 132; *cf. Rot. Parl.*, III. 494. Similarly, *Rot. Parl.*, III. 468, 591, 613, 659, and *Statutes*, II. 120, 150, 159, 166, respectively, and *Rot. Parl.*, IV. 19.

[54] *Rot. Parl.*, III. 454, 485, 522, 545, 567, 622; IV. 3, 15, 34, 62, 70, 94, 106; for the period after 1417, *ibid.*, IV. 169, 261, 295, 316, 367, 388, 481. From 1435 on, the chancellor's speech is not recorded at all, or receives the barest mention.

[55] *Ibid.*, IV. 49, 113, 120, 125, 146, 154, 253.

SOME ASPECTS OF AMERICAN STATE DEBTS IN THE FORTIES

A creditor has more than an academic interest in the history of an unpaid debt. Perhaps this explains the continual discussion by Europeans of the outstanding obligations of certain American states. In view of the changed position of the United States from a debtor to a creditor nation it may be advantageous to recall both to European holders of these state securities and to Americans the circumstances surrounding the origin of the American state debt controversies; the motives which led the debtors to borrow and the lenders to lend; the failure of European creditors and American debtors to understand each other in the forties; and the efforts made by the creditors during these years to recover their funds.

During the boom period of the thirties the people of the United States indulged in an orgy of canal and railroad building and of bank organization. The success of the Erie Canal inaugurated a mania for internal improvements. Eastern seaboard states vied with each other in their impetuous haste to capture the lucrative trade of the rapidly developing West. Enormous debts were piled up with little attention given by the people to their ultimate payment. It was expected that the revenue derived from the public works would liquidate the debts. As the fever spread to the newer communities in the West state legislatures were urged to vote large appropriations for internal improvements and to borrow the money, pledging the faith of the state for the redemption of the principal and interest of the loans. Michigan, Illinois, and Indiana planned extensive systems of internal improvements far in excess of the limited resources of their citizens. In the South, where capital was scarce and there was a dearth of ready currency, the mania for borrowing took the form of floating loans to procure the working capital of newly chartered banks. By 1839 over $170,000,000 of stock had been issued or authorized to be issued by American states. Of this amount $52,640,000 were for banking purposes, $69,201,515 for canals, $42,871,084 for railroads, and $6,618,958 for turnpikes.[1]

It was not a difficult task to induce European investors to purchase American stocks and bonds. There was an abundance of idle funds in

[1] *American Almanac*, 1840, p. 105, from the report of Comptroller A. C. Flagg, of New York.

the London money market. Money could be borrowed in Europe at five per cent., while in America the rates were seven or eight per cent.[2] Investors bought with avidity American state securities carrying higher interest than European stocks yielded.[3] The British were tired of seeing their accumulated capital wasted on powder and shot, as had proved to be the case with many of the loans to foreign countries. The Americans were borrowing apparently to carry on productive enterprises; and the faith and honor of the states, as well as mortgages upon private property, were pledged for the redemption of the loans. Since American stocks and bonds were not listed on the Stock Exchange, being from their very nature and the small amount of each particular stock unsuited for time bargains and jobbing, they were subject to less frequent fluctuations in price. This appealed to the British for they purchased these stocks as a safe and more or less permanent investment and not for speculative purposes.[4] The success which had rewarded English capitalists in former loans to the United States, the extinction of our national debt, and the rapidity with which American merchants paid off their private obligations following the crisis of 1837 enhanced the willingness of the British to place implicit faith in American loans. By 1839 it was estimated that British subjects held between 110 and 165 millions of dollars of American stocks.[5]

American state loans for canals, railroads, and banks reached the London money market through the channels of the United States Bank of Pennsylvania and various other American banking houses. In London Baring Brothers and Company, Overend, Gurney, and Company, Frederick Huth and Company, Palmer, MacKillop, Dent, and Company, the Rothschilds, and others together with Hope and Company of Amsterdam introduced them to their clients. The Barings apparently received the most reliable information for they were kept in close touch with American financial and political affairs by their competent representative T. W. Ward of Prime, Ward, and Company. The data which contractors of loans were asked either to send or bring with them were copies of the state laws, statistical information concerning the resources,

[2] Meinertzhagen to Funes, Oct. 11, 1844, Huth MSS. This is a collection of the private correspondence of Frederick Huth and Company of London to which the writer was given access.

[3] Huth to Goodhue, May 6, Sept. 14, 1836, *ibid.*

[4] Circular to Bankers, Feb. 23, Mar. 9, 1838; Mar. 1, May 31, 1839; Huth to Goodhue, May 6, 1836, *ibid.*

[5] Garland's speech in Congress, *Niles' Register*, July 21, 1838; *House Reports*, 27 Cong., 3 sess., vol. IV., no. 296; estimate sent Lord Palmerston by British consuls in U. S., McTavish to Palmerston, Apr. 8, 1839, Public Record Office, F. O. 5,337.

wealth, and total indebtedness of the state, and a statement of their authority to negotiate the loans.[6]

New and practically unknown states found it difficult to negotiate loans. There was also reluctance upon the part of Europeans to touch stocks issued by slaveholding states. But all stocks and bonds carrying the pledge of the faith of the state were given careful consideration. As Huth wrote one of his American agents it was the guaranty of the state which alone made these stocks "palatable to European capitalists";[7] and the same statement is found constantly recurring in the correspondence of the bankers and in the columns of the press.

The best recommendation for an American loan was to have the indorsement of the United States Bank. The periodical statements of the bank fully justified the high esteem in which it was held abroad.[8] With the possible exception of the Barings few entertained any doubt of the financial stability of the United States Bank. English bankers were willing to trust it as they trusted the Bank of England.

It was Nicholas Biddle and his London agent Jaudon who helped to introduce the Mississippi and Florida bonds to European investors. The charter of the Mississippi Union Bank provided that the state bonds should not be sold for less than their par value. Nevertheless, the commissioners of the bank sold $5,000,000 of these bonds to Biddle on credit. Since the United States Bank paid for these bonds in five equal installments while the interest commenced from the date of the sale, it was later claimed that the bonds were sold for less than par. Moreover the act authorizing the issuance of the bonds had not been passed by two successive legislatures and approved by the people, as the state constitution required.

When the Mississippi bonds were sent to England for sale, Biddle wrote Jaudon stressing the agricultural resources of Mississippi and the high character of Wilkins, one of the commissioners, as the best guaranty that the state would fulfill its engagements.[9] Jaudon succeeded in disposing of $2,000,000 of these bonds in November, 1838, and "the remainder were pledged by him as collateral for loans made by that bank in November and December, 1839, and January and February, 1840".

[6] Baring to Prime, Ward, and Company, Oct., 1834, Baring MSS., Ottawa, Canada.

[7] Hope to Baring, Aug. 16, 1833, Baring MSS.; Huth to Perit, Nov. 22, 1837, Huth MSS.; Forstall to Ward, Nov. 19, 1832; Hope to Baring, Aug. 16, 1833, Baring MSS.; Circular to Bankers, Nov. 8, 1839. Huth declared that the Dutch insisted on state guarantees. Huth to Perit, Apr. 14, 28, Dec. 13, 1838, Huth MSS.

[8] *Niles' Register*, Jan. 16, 1841; Meinertzhagen to Funes, Oct. 11, 1844, Huth MSS.

[9] Biddle to Jaudon, Oct. 2, 1838, *ibid.*

There is no evidence that anyone in England had knowledge that the bonds had been sold to the United States Bank on credit or that the state had not received the whole of their value until Governor McNutt in his message of 1839 stated the terms of the sale.[10] When conditions began to grow serious in Mississippi, Jaudon assured Huth that there was no cause for alarm quoting Biddle's indorsement verbatim and Governor McNutt's message as proof that there could not be "the shadow of doubt as to the solidity of the Mississippi state stock".[11]

In like manner Jaudon gave Colonel John Gamble, president of the Union Bank of Florida, a letter of introduction to Hope in which the Florida bank bonds were described "as solid and desirable a security as any in the market". This was contrary to the information which the Barings were receiving; and as Hope was in communication with the Barings and they were themselves dubious of the Florida bonds,[12] Colonel Gamble succeeded in disposing of only $100,000 of his bonds to this firm at a discount of three per cent. in violation of the state statute.

The practice of American states and territories in sending agents direct to Europe enhanced the difficulties of the European financiers for it deprived them of the salutary discrimination of their correspondents who were better judges than themselves of the security offered.[13] Every assurance was given by these high pressure salesmen that the loans were adequately secured. Colonel Gamble assured the Dutch bankers that the economic possibilities of Florida were unsurpassed. "So great are her advantages of soil and climate", declared the enthusiastic Gamble, "that the query is not 'what can Florida produce' but 'what production will yield the greatest profit with the least labor.'" There was no need to be alarmed over the safety of the territorial bonds of Florida, for a territory was not a "political infant, incapable in law of acting for itself, or of contracting with others without the consent of a guardian". A territorial legislature of Florida had the authority to issue these bonds and Congress had tacitly given its sanction by not prohibiting their issuance when the Florida banks were investigated by a committee headed by Webster in 1836.[14] The agent of the North American Trust

[10] Memorandum on Mississippi bonds, *ibid.*

[11] Memorandum of Mississippi stock sent by Jaudon, Feb. 25, 1840, *ibid.*

[12] Jaudon to Hope, Sept. 12, 1838, Hope MSS. The writer was given access to the private correspondence and records of Hope and Company of Amsterdam. Ward to Baring, Aug. 15, 1839; Hope to Baring, Dec. 4, 1838; Baring to Hope, Dec. 7, 1838; Hope to Baring, Jan. 6, 1839, Baring MSS.

[13] Baring to Prime, Ward, King, and Company, June 12, 1839, *ibid.*

[14] Notes on the subject of the Florida bonds by Gamble in Hope MSS. For Webster report consult *Sen. Doc.*, 24 Cong., 1 sess., vol. VI., no. 409.

and Banking Company sent Huth a copy of the charter of the Real Estate Bank of Arkansas along with copious statistical data and certificates from the War and Treasury departments showing their confidence by actual investments in these bonds. "The nature of these securities is of a very high order", wrote Murray, "not only having the faith and property of a young, vigorous, and thriving state pledged for their redemption, but also all the effects of the bank itself."[15] In the light of these and other statements the lack of prudence on the part of European financiers becomes more understandable. The signed contracts always specified that the principal and interest should be made payable in London and Amsterdam in pounds sterling or florins, to satisfy the investing public, and the commission allowed the bankers ranged up to three and a half per cent.[16]

The wisdom of investing in American securities was debated in the columns of the London press. The Circular to Bankers and the *Morning Chronicle* urged British investors to place their surplus capital in American enterprises. "We feel convinced", announced the *Morning Chronicle,* "that persons desirous of investing money in any of the principal American securities will find on inquiry that we have never over-rated the honor and good faith which have always been shown by the United States to her creditors." Attention was also called to the investments by the United States government in state stocks as proof that the security of "even the newest and smallest states, Arkansas, for instance", was satisfactory to the government in Washington.[17] At the same time, the London *Times* was questioning the constitutional power of individual American states to contract loans and was cautioning British investors not to purchase them. "The state loans depend upon banking projects and internal improvements, of which, probably, not one in ten, for years to come", declared the skeptical *Times,* "will pay its own expenses, especially in the remoter states." The "debtor is at a great distance, compellable to good faith by no law whatever"; and investors purchasing bank bonds should realize that "There exists . . . no sort of control, no real responsibility, nothing which can protect the shareholder at a

[15] Inclosure to Huth from Murray, June 19, 1839, Huth MSS.

[16] The data for this statement is based upon numerous letters in the Baring, Huth, and Hope correspondence. The *Democratic Review,* XVI. 306, is incorrect as regards commissions.

[17] These statements were made at the time the Florida loan was being marketed in London, *Morning Chronicle,* Feb. 19, 1839; Apr. 23, 1840. The amount invested by the U. S. government in state stocks is given in *House Doc.,* 26 Cong., 1 sess., Vol. III., no. 145; *House Reports,* 27 Cong., 3 sess., Vol. IV., no. 296, pp. 47–446.

distance . . . ".[18] The advice of the *Times* was disregarded by a public who preferred to trust the word of their bankers and the prospectuses which were issued quoting verbatim the statements made by authorized agents of the states.[19]

The warnings of the *Times* seemed to be verified by the publication of Comptroller Flagg's report which pointed out the rapidity with which the indebtedness of the states was mounting. Between 1835 and 1838 the total was increased over $108,000,000.[20] During the same period the banking capital of the Union was increased $109,000,000. In turn the banks augmented their paper circulation $46,000,000, and their loans and discounts $160,000,000. The whole financial structure of the United States was on the verge of a collapse; and if this occurred, as it did in the fall of 1839, would the meager resources of some of the states afford the means to meet the heavy obligations they had incurred without resorting to heavy taxation? And would the people submit to the imposition of such taxes? The serious condition of affairs in the United States began to dawn upon British capitalists and the public.

To allay the alarm of investors and to bolster up the sagging market the Barings determined to obtain the legal opinion of Daniel Webster on the power of American states to contract loans and the attitude of Americans on the sanctity of contracts. Webster was in England presumably on a pleasure trip although the journey had been undertaken at Jaudon's suggestion. The Barings were well acquainted with Webster's position and influence among his countrymen; and on frequent occasions they advanced funds to him when he was in pecuniary difficulties.[21] On October 12, 1839, the Barings wrote Webster asking whether the state legislatures were empowered to contract loans at home and abroad. To this inquiry Webster replied that the legislatures did possess this authority since each was an "independent, sovereign political community, except in so far as certain powers had been conferred upon the general government". The security for these loans rested upon the plighted faith of the states; and in some cases the income or revenue expected to be derived from the canals and railroads, in others valuable tracts of land had been specifically set aside for their redemption. No state could rid itself of these obligations; nothing but gold and silver could be offered in discharge of these debts. This correspondence was

[18] London *Times*, Dec. 15, 1838, Mar. 5, 1839.

[19] See Prospectus of Maryland Loan in Baring Printed Material, Oct. 12, 1837.

[20] *American Almanac*, 1840, p. 106.

[21] *The Private Correspondence of Daniel Webster*, Fletcher Webster, ed., II. 45. Ward to Baring, June 27, 1835; Apr. 29, May 4, 13, 1839, Baring MSS.

given to the press [22] and there is little doubt that the legal opinion of the American Burke carried great weight in the investing circles, for Webster later acknowledged that he was able to dispose of Massachusetts stock to the sum of £40,000 while in England.[23]

It was realized, however, that more than Webster's word was needed to uphold American credit. Two days after Webster's letter was received, the Barings issued a circular upon American stocks in which they pointed out that if the whole scheme of internal improvements were carried into effect by means of foreign capital a more comprehensive guaranty than that of the individual states would be required. "A national pledge would undoubtedly collect capital together from all parts of Europe." [24]

The Baring circular attracted considerable attention in the United States. Leading Whig journals sponsored the proposition of Federal assumption of state debts.[25] Democratic papers stigmatized the scheme as a Baring and Webster plot to foist upon the national government the debts of the states. They erred, however, in ascribing its origin to foreigners. The plan owed its inception to the necessities of the United States Bank. On October 1, 1839, a close friend of Biddle wrote Joshua Bates, the Yankee member of Barings, of the need of procuring foreign capital to complete the public works. "I would suggest", wrote Davis, "that some intimation be given from a source that would command attention—that a *reasonable* amount of capital can be relied on from England on United States government security but little if anything on *State Security* alone." [26]

Whatever expectations the bankers had that their plan might succeed was destroyed by the prejudice aroused over its supposedly foreign origin. When Congress assembled Senator Benton of Missouri denounced the proposition as unconstitutional, inexpedient, and unjust. With a view to the coming presidential election the Senate adopted a resolution specifically disclaiming all responsibility on the part of the

[22] For comments on Webster's opinion consult London *Times*, Nov. 21, 1839. A vigorous attack by an American can be found in *A Letter to Daniel Webster . . . in Reply, etc.*, by Junius. Bates wrote Webster that it was believed that this pamphlet was written by C. J. Ingersoll of Philadelphia and to lessen its influence the *Morning Chronicle* asserted that the author belonged to the Fanny Wright party. Bates to Webster, Apr. 1840, Baring MSS.

[23] London *Times*, Nov. 6, 1840.

[24] Circular to Bankers, Jan. 10, 1840.

[25] Whig press opinions are quoted in *Congressional Globe*, 26 Cong., 1 sess., app., pp. 127, 128.

[26] C. A. Davis to Bates, Oct. 1, 1839; see also letters of Nov. 16, 1839, Oct. 10, 1840, Baring MSS.

Federal government for the state debts.[27] Benton's move gave the champions of the debtors a theme and an opportunity to attack the gigantic schemes of internal improvements and the manner in which the banks had marketed their securities. In Pennsylvania, Maryland, Mississippi, and elsewhere opponents of the internal improvement projects and the banks gained control. Instead of stabilizing American credit the inadvertent moves of international bankers assisted in discrediting state stock; and after 1839 no considerable amount of state securities was sold abroad.

Within the next few years there was an increasing disposition upon the part of the states to take lightly their engagements. Between 1841 and 1842 eight states and one territory defaulted on their interest payments. Mississippi repudiated the five millions of Union Bank bonds on the ground that the law providing for their issuance was unconstitutional and that the bonds had been sold on credit to the United States Bank.[28] Florida disavowed her responsibility for $3,900,000 of bonds on the ground that the territorial legislature was not empowered to issue them.[29] Michigan refused to recognize the validity of those bonds for which she had received no payment from the United States Bank.[30] Pennsylvania, Maryland, Indiana, Illinois, Arkansas, and Louisiana announced their inability to pay without definitely refusing to do so.

To understand the actions of the various states it is necessary to appreciate the condition then existing in the United States. The universal indebtedness created throughout the country a loose sense of morality. Even among men of character and right purpose Ward, the correspondent of the Barings, found an apathetic and indifferent attitude upon the subject of state debts. This he accounted for, in part, on the supposition that many had not reflected upon the matter, and, in part, by the popular fallacy that it was a state "and not an *individual* concern".[31] If this state of affairs existed in wealthy communities, such as Pennsylvania and Maryland, as it did, there was more likelihood for

[27] *Cong. Globe*, 26 Cong., 1 sess., app., pp. 85–93; *Sen. Doc.*, 26 Cong., 1 sess., vol. IV., no. 153, p. 15.

[28] Mississippi *Sen. Journal*, 1842, p. 653–654. Mississippi later repudiated $2,000,000 of Planters' Bank bonds.

[29] Florida *Laws*, 1842, p. 53; Florida *Leg. Council Journal*, 1843, pp. 41, 74, 75, 162, 163, 174, 175; Florida *Sen. Journal*, 1843, pp. 105, 117, 144, 145.

[30] W. L. Jenks, Michigan Five Million Dollar Loan in *Michigan History Magazine*, XV. 602–606.

[31] Ward to Carey, Mar. 21, 1844. *Cf.* also unsigned memorandum on state debts, Dec. 12, 1839, Baring MSS.

its prevalence in Southern and Western states where the masses had given little thought to monied and commercial transactions. The moral force of sustaining public faith weighed lightly with those who were overwhelmed by their own personal indebtedness, and in the legislatures few had the moral courage or political honesty to urge the maintenance of state credit. "In Arkansas", wrote a correspondent to Huth, "not more than 20,000 of her 90,000 of population" had "any property to tax"; and "more than one half of this 20,000" were indebted "to the banks that were founded with the money borrowed on the faith of the state". In addition to what the people owed the banks there were "other and more urgent debts owing amongst each other and to the citizens of other states".[32] In Mississippi the people were moving to Texas to evade their debts and when repudiation came the report of the state treasurer showed a balance in the treasury of thirty-four cents and receipts for claims upon broken banks and notes of insolvent railroad companies.[33] Florida with a population of less than 50,000 had a per capita debt of $200.[34] Suppose foreign capitalists did not lend any more to the states? "Well who cares if they don't", thundered the *Floridian*. "We are now as a community heels over head in debt and can scarcely pay the interest."[35]

Everywhere there was a sullen resentment against taxation and a determination upon the part of the masses to hold the banks responsible for their difficulties. Let the bondholders look to the United States Bank or to the other banks for their payments. Why should the poor be taxed to support the opulent classes in foreign lands who, it was believed, held the bulk of these securities. On the other hand, the banks were unable to meet their obligations due to the insolvency of their debtors,[36] while state repudiation freed the stockholders of their liabilities. It is significant that in the Mississippi legislature which voted for repudiation the anti-bond paying members owned 772 shares of stock in the Union Bank while those who were in favor of sustaining the state's credit owned 462 shares. If the state cancelled the bonds, the stockholders would be relieved of their liabilities to the bank. It is claimed that the anti-bond paying members owed more than $119,000 on their

[32] Anderson to Dillon, Oct. 20, 1843; Davies to Beers, Dec. 6, 1842, Huth MSS. These letters were forwarded to Huth.

[33] Governor's message quoting State Treasurer's Report, Miss. *Sen. Jour.*, 1843, p. 26. See also unsigned memorandum on state debts, Dec. 12, 1839, Baring MSS.

[34] *House Doc.*, 26 Cong., 2 sess., vol. IV., no. 111, pp. 257–259.

[35] *Floridian*, Mar. 14, 1840.

[36] Pike to Huth, Nov. 28, 1843, Huth MSS.

personal accounts to the bank. Thus the debtor legislators protected their own interest while they brought dishonor to the state.[37]

English and Dutch investors had paid high rates in the currency of the United States for state stock,[38] and if the states had acted imprudently or their agents had flouted state statutes these investors could see no justification for the non-fulfillment of the contracts. Nevertheless, the fashion of foreign creditors indulging in wholesale denunciation of Americans did not help their cause. The *Morning Chronicle* warned the British that "Calm reason, sound argument, and a plain statement of facts . . . " would be more likely to convince Americans that repudiation was against their own interests than by hurling invectives at them.[39]

Meanwhile the foreign bankers were endeavoring to safeguard as best they could the interests of their clients. Before Mississippi repudiated a memorial was drafted by the Rothschilds. A copy was presented to Lord Palmerston, the British foreign secretary, requesting that it be presented through the medium of His Majesty's minister at Washington. Lord Palmerston curtly refused to do this on the ground that "British subjects who buy foreign securities do so at their own risk and must abide the consequences".[40] The desire upon the part of the United States government to float a loan in Europe about this time appeared to afford an opportunity to impress the national government with the disastrous effects of state repudiation. If all the capitalists of Europe united not to touch the loan it was hoped the Federal government would be compelled to take energetic measures.

When certain European bankers suggested this plan to the Barings they agreed that it was the duty of financiers to refuse further loans to a government which had failed to comply with its engagements. But the Barings doubted the feasibility of enforcing that principle "towards the United States government and towards those states that had always punctually met their engagements". The Barings reminded their fellow financiers that the twenty-six states that formed the United States were "all sovereign and independent" and although circumstances might in time enable the general government to aid the states "that government has no power or *right* to interfere". The only case of positive repudiation

[37] *Republican*, Mar. 5, Dec. 3, 1842, quoted in C. C. Alexander, A History of State Banking in Mississippi (unpublished thesis).

[38] This significant fact is generally overlooked in all discussions. The quotations of American stocks in American currency is given in *Bankers' Magazine*, I. 658–659.

[39] *Morning Chronicle*, Sept. 6, 1842, Nov. 15, 1843.

[40] Rothschild to Palmerston, May 21, 1841; Bidwell to Rothschild, June 3, 1841, F. O. 5,372,373. Bidwell wrote at Palmerston's suggestion and to the above in Palmerston's handwriting was added "of any speculation of this kind which they may enter into".

at that time was Mississippi. "Is it wise", wrote the Barings, "for this single instance of dishonesty in a remote and unimportant state to endeavor to brand the whole United States as wanting in good faith? We think not." Instead of employing coercion capitalists should treat "every state on its own merits" and give confidence where it was deserved. The views of the Barings, however, were overruled by the opposition of other bankers and a disillusioned public.[41]

As it became apparent that the Federal government would not assume the state debts European financiers determined to employ other methods. For months Ward had been urging the Barings to procure able writers to set the American people right on state debts. To this the Barings had always replied "people will try to be honest when they feel more at ease".[42] Nevertheless, in July, 1843, the Barings joined five other banking houses in subscribing to a fund of £2000 for the purpose of appointing one or more agents in Pennsylvania to represent the interests of the foreign creditors. Ward was selected to direct the campaign. He was to choose as agents persons of tact and discretion who were to receive "a liberal but not extravagant compensation, not more than five thousand dollars besides a reasonable allowance for contingent expenses". These agents were to write for the newspapers; organize meetings of the domestic stockholders for the purpose of explaining the importance to the state of keeping good faith with its creditors at home and abroad and the ease with which this could be achieved. The agents were also "to endeavor to enlist the clergy to point out from the pulpit" the "moral wrong and danger to the people of not acting honorably". It was hoped resumption by Pennsylvania would have a salutary effect upon other states.[43]

Under the competent leadership of Ward a nation wide campaign was inaugurated to rehabilitate state credit. Nathan Hale, editor of the Boston *Advertiser,* was Ward's ablest lieutenant and did yeoman service in the cause. Articles appearing in Hale's paper were republished in other newspapers. The columns of the New York *Journal of Commerce,* New York *Evening Post,* New York *American,* New York *Courier and Enquirer,* and other leading newspapers inserted articles either written or inspired by the adroit hand of the indefatigable Ward. The editors were generally paid ten dollars for such insertions; in the

[41] Hope to Baring, May 23, 1842; Baring to Vanderhoop, May 27, 1842, Baring MSS. On U. S. failure to secure the loan, consult London *Times,* Apr. 21, 1843; *Niles' Register,* Sept. 17, 1842.

[42] Ward to Baring, May 14, 15, 1843, Baring MSS.

[43] Baring to Ward, June 19, July 3, 1843, *ibid.*

case of the New York *Evening Post* and the New York *American* and for an editorial notice in one or two papers, twenty dollars; while occasional articles were published without pay. Gales and Seaton of the *National Intelligencer* were offered two hundred dollars to republish two articles. They declined to do so but expressed their willingness to coöperate. Not much assistance, however, was rendered by this paper. Ward could not explain "the backwardness of editors" to espouse the cause of the creditors and wondered whether it was due to the unpopularity of the subject or merely to their apathetic attitude.[44]

The religious press and church organizations cordially coöperated with Ward. Individual members of the American and Baptist boards, and particularly Dr. Francis Wayland of Brown University, assisted in distributing material, writing to clergymen, and lending their counsel. No evidence has been found that the religious press was subsidized. Articles did appear in the New York *Observer* at Ward's suggestion and a former member of the staff of that paper was sent to interview the Lutheran clergymen in Pennsylvania for it was claimed the Germans in that state opposed heavier taxes. Lutheran leaders indignantly repelled these charges although they acknowledged that the Germans "were more indignant than others at the dishonesty of politicians and therefore less disposed to trust them with money for any purpose".[45]

The most effective articles published were those written by Alexander Everett and Benjamin R. Curtis, later a Justice of the United States Supreme Court, which appeared respectively in the *Democratic Review* and the *North American Review* for January, 1844. Both were prepared under Ward's personal supervision. The comprehensive account by Judge Curtis, which has been quoted by every writer on this subject, was based upon an outline furnished by Ward.[46] When Curtis was later offered $350 for his services he declined the remuneration. A friend of his had questioned "whether it would be best" for him "to be paid by your friends". "I cannot now state any very strong reason why I should not treat it as a matter of business", wrote Curtis to Ward, "except the feeling which constantly recurs that I had rather not; and it is a rule which I have endeavored to follow that when I have any scruples re-

[44] Ward to Gales and Seaton, Nov. 23, 1843; Ward to Baring, Dec. 27, 1843; S. Ward to T. Ward, Jan. 9, 1844; Ward to Latrobe, Jan. 11, 1844; Ward to Perit, Jan. 13, 1844; Latrobe to Ward, Jan. 15, 1844, *ibid.*

[45] Wayland to Ward, Nov. 28, 1843, Jan. 9, 1844; Ward to Perit, Jan. 4, 1844; Ward to Wayland, Jan. 4, 10, 1844; Tracy to Latrobe, Jan. 25, 1844, *ibid.*

[46] Ward to Baring, Aug. 29, 30, Nov. 14, 29 (with inclosure), and Dec. 8, 1843, *ibid.*

specting any pecuniary matter it is safest and best to be governed by them without attempting to find much logic for their support." [47]

The services of political leaders were also solicited. Webster was most anxious to help and delivered a number of speeches. At Webster's suggestion Ward engaged Senator Robert J. Walker and Judge Montgomery, both of Mississippi, to carry a suit on the Union Bank bonds through the Mississippi courts and Webster to argue the case in the United States Supreme Court if it reached that tribunal. Walker was to receive $200 as his legal fee and Judge Montgomery and Webster $100 each; and fifteen per cent. of whatever was recovered was to go to Walker and Montgomery while Webster's share was to be five per cent. Judge Montgomery declined to serve. The Mississippi efforts proved futile and when Walker became Secretary of the Treasury his services were discontinued.[48] The Barings doubted the wisdom of employing Webster. As a public man he should see the necessity of acting while "the fact of his being paid would lessen his influence". When Ward on his own initiative gave Webster $200 the Barings objected. "We should have liked", they wrote Ward, "when we are sometimes made the objects of attacks to be able to say that as a business and foreign house we remain neutral in all political struggles." Ward recognized their point of view and paid Webster himself. "It is a humiliating fact", wrote Ward on one occasion, "that the first talents in the country even must be bought and paid for in the highest of causes." It is quite evident from a careful examination of the Baring manuscripts that they were sincere when they acknowledged to Ward some years later that they were never able to reconcile themselves to the propriety "of taking American papers into pay for the purpose even of advocating principles of honesty. It ought to be done without English money." [49]

While Ward was carrying on his campaign Reid, Irving, and Company secured the services of Edmund J. Forstall of New Orleans to agitate the claims of their clients in Mississippi. Forstall secured the publication of a series of articles in a Jackson paper which he had later bound in a volume entitled *Nine Years of Democratic Rule in Mississippi*. A copy of this pamphlet was sent to every Congressman and department head in Washington. Then convinced that he had done all

[47] Ward to Curtis, Jan. 11, May 13, 1844; Curtis to Ward, May 15, 1844, *ibid.*

[48] Ward to Baring, Nov. 28, Dec. 27, 1843; Mar. 30, 1844; Nov. 22, 1848, *ibid.*

[49] Baring to Ward, Nov. 18, 1843; Ward to Baring, Jan. 30, 1844; Baring to Ward, Nov. 2, 1844; Ward to Baring, Nov. 22, 1844, *ibid.* *Cf.* also Ward to Baring, Sept. 27, Oct. 16, 1844; Baring to Ward, Apr. 18, 1846, *ibid.*

that could be accomplished Forstall discontinued his efforts.[50] Meanwhile Hope and Huth were deluging the Mississippi and Florida legislatures in a fruitless attempt to create public sentiment in behalf of the bondholders.

For almost a century the unpaid debts incurred during the forties have been a subject of controversy. In the light of the foregoing discussion it is evident that the agents of the states violated state statutes in negotiating the loans and American bankers aided and abetted them. These acts were unknown to foreign investors when they purchased the bonds. It was the guaranty of the states, the confidence placed in the United States Bank, the high rate of interest which American securities carried, and the high standing of national credit which induced European capitalists to buy American stocks and bonds. The fact that the United States government invested its funds in some of these securities seemed additional proof of their soundness. When American credit began to collapse attempts were made by the creditors to persuade the Federal government to assume the state debts; but the Barings privately acknowledged that the national government was not responsible for the debts of the states. After the British government refused to sponsor the claims of their citizens and it was apparent that the United States government would not intervene in behalf of the creditors the bondholders endeavored to awaken the moral consciousness of the American public. But the lack of concentrated effort upon their part and the fact that public opinion had already been mobilized against their claims largely account for the failures in Mississippi and Florida. While it is true that the meager resources of the American people made it impossible for them to meet their obligations when they fell due, an inability to pay was no justification for refusal to pay.

REGINALD C. MCGRANE.

The University of Cincinnati.

[50] Reid, Irving, and Company to Forstall, Aug. 4, 1845; Forstall to Baring, Apr. 12, 1853, *ibid.*

THE REACTION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS TO DARWINISM

DARWIN's characteristic perspicacity is nowhere better illustrated than in his prophecy of the reaction of the world of science. He admitted at once that it would be impossible to convince those older men "... whose minds are stocked with a multitude of facts, all viewed ... from a point of view directly opposite to mine. ... A few naturalists endowed with much flexibility of mind and who have already begun to doubt the immutability of species, may be influenced by this volume; but I look with confidence to the young and rising naturalists, who will be able to view both sides with impartiality."[1] Nor was Darwin mistaken, for the younger men, untrammeled by tradition, enlisted under the new banner and became its stanchest supporters. But even for those naturalists "endowed with much flexibility of mind" an intellectual conversion was slow and painful. Sir Charles Lyell, Darwin's friend, could not bring himself to subscribe to the doctrines implied in the *Origin of Species* until the tenth edition of his famous *Principles* (1868) although his own studies had led him to the very door of Darwin's thought.[2] James Dwight Dana reluctantly yielded to a belief in evolution, but only after Darwinian natural selection had been questioned as the sole cause and assigned a place among many factors causing development. The career of Louis Agassiz vindicated Darwin's assertion that the older naturalists could hardly be expected to accept teachings contrary to the predilections of a lifetime. He remained the most resolute opponent of evolution and was prevented only by death from publishing what he believed would be a complete refutation of the transmutation theory.

In the period now under review, the American scientific world was dominated by a formidable triumvirate consisting of Louis Agassiz, James Dwight Dana, and Asa Gray. These men whose names adorned the title-page of the *American Journal of Science and Arts,* were mature students and justly regarded as authorities in their respective fields.

[1] Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of the Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* (London, 1859), p. 417.

[2] Charles Lyell, *Principles of Geology or the Modern Changes of the Earth and its Inhabitants* (London, 1868), II. 276 ff.; *Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley,* Leonard Huxley, ed. (New York, 1900), I. 185; *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin,* Francis Darwin, ed. (New York, 1887), III. 8, 11, 13, 29.

Jean Louis Rodolphe Agassiz was one of the foremost naturalists of his generation[3] whose scientific labors brought fame and honor to the country of his adoption. He was born in Switzerland in 1803, and he had established more than a local reputation by 1847 when he was called to a professorship of geology and zoölogy at Harvard, a position he held until his death in 1873.

The whole course of Agassiz's intellectual life made a belief in evolutionary views almost impossible. He had been a pupil of Georges Cuvier whose decided opposition to the *Philosophie Zoologique* of Lamarck in 1809 had effectively retarded the progress of evolutionary thought in the early years of the nineteenth century. Agassiz inherited from his great preceptor the doctrine of the permanence of type[4] and he occupies a position in the controversy over Darwinism strikingly similar to that taken by his master in the earlier skirmish with Lamarck. In addition to his unswerving loyalty to the concept of immutability, he was of a deeply religious mind.[5] He was not concerned with the externalities of religion, indeed he was scornful of them, but his profoundly philosophical nature, not untinged by inherited reverence, caused him to see in all the manifestations of nature evidences of divine plan and purpose.

Agassiz's consistent and unrelenting opposition has led to considerable speculation as to the motives which inspired it. It was never forgotten, by those who attempted to analyze his attitude, that he was the son of a Protestant divine. This was held to have dictated his refusal to subscribe to a conception so apparently mechanistic as Darwinism, but without disparaging the influences of heredity and environment this circumstance cannot be regarded as more than a contributory factor. Some of his skeptical European contemporaries whispered that his uncompromising theism was an artfully designed pose to induce his wealthy American

[3] George B. Emerson, What We owe to Louis Agassiz as a Teacher, *Memorial Meeting of the Boston Society of Natural History* (Boston, 1874), p. 13; Arnold Guyot, Memoir of Louis Agassiz, National Academy of Sciences, *Biographical Memoirs* (Washington, 1886), III. 39; D. C. Gilman, *Louis Agassiz as a Leader of Science in America* (n. p., 1873), pp. 1, 2; California Academy of Sciences, *Proceedings*, Agassiz Memorial Meeting (San Francisco, 1874), V. 220–242, and other references cited below.

[4] Henry Fairfield Osborn, *From the Greeks to Darwin* (New York, 1894). Louis Agassiz, *An Essay on Classification* (London, 1859), p. 78, and *passim*.

[5] Emerson, *Memorial Meeting*, pp. 13, 14; Charles Frederick Holder, *Louis Agassiz, His Life and Work* (New York, 1893), pp. 182 ff.; William James, *Louis Agassiz* (Cambridge, 1897), p. 11; Thomas Hill, *Life is more than Meat, a Sermon* (Portland, Me., 1874).

admirers to open their coffers in the interest of his scientific labors.[6] Another variation of this same theme was the assertion that he was reluctant to offend the clergy of Boston who were intimately associated with his father-in-law and patron, Thomas Carey. There is absolutely no evidence to support such a view and even the casual reader of Agassiz's *Correspondence* will recognize at once that such motives were inconsistent with his character. It has sometimes been urged that Agassiz's opposition was engendered by the realization that if Darwin was right, Agassiz was wrong.[7] If, in other words, the principle of the *Origin* was correct, the thesis presented in the *Essay on Classification* was obviously based on a faulty premise. The imputation of such petty and intellectually dishonest motives to a man as steadfast and sincere as Agassiz are as false as they are unfair. His opposition was based on definitely intellectual grounds and what he believed to be serious scientific objections. It cannot be denied that his vision was somewhat befogged by philosophical and metaphysical prepossessions,[8] but that is so patently a mortal frailty as to be immediately forgiven.

Throughout the first period of the controversy in America, which may roughly be said to close with his death in 1873, Agassiz was the mainstay of the opposition. His preponderating influence in scientific circles prevented a too hasty acceptance among professional naturalists who were wary of espousing views which the greatest authority of the day branded as a "mere mine of assertions".[9] Theological defiance also centered around Agassiz's rejection and that gentleman who but a short nine years before was regarded with suspicion by the clerical fraternity was hailed as the "prince of naturalists and zoologists" and heartily praised for "eloquently protesting against the whole development or evolution theory, in relation to the kingdom of life, as wholly unsupported by facts and of pernicious tendency".[10]

[6] On his father's side there were six generations of Protestant ministers, Gilman, California Academy of Sciences, *Proceedings*, V. 226. Moncure D. Conway, *Autobiography, Memoirs and Experiences* (Boston, 1904), I. 153. Charles M. Barrows, *Acts and Anecdotes of Authors* (Boston, 1887), pp. 13, 14.

[7] *Letters of Charles Eliot Norton with Biographical Comment*, Sara Norton and M. A. DeWolfe Howe, eds. (Boston, 1913), I. 202; *Methodist Quarterly Review*, XLIII. (Oct., 1861) 607.

[8] John Fiske, Agassiz and Darwinism, *Popular Science Monthly*, III. (Oct., 1873) 696, 697.

[9] Edward Sylvester Morse, What American Zoologists have done for Evolution, American Association for the Advancement of Science, *Proceedings*, XXV. (Aug., 1876) 140; Professor Agassiz on the Origin of Species, *American Journal of Science and Arts*, XXX. (July, 1860) 142–154.

[10] Herbert Spencer's Philosophy; Atheism, Pantheism, Materialism, *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, XXXVII. (Apr., 1865) 267, 268.

In 1850, Agassiz had outraged the clerical world by declaring his belief in the multiple origin of the human race.[11] For this heresy he earned the scorn and condemnation of the orthodox, and some were slow to forgive.[12] In the face of a much more dangerous crisis, however, it was possible to forget such a transgression and to bless a man who could say that "All the facts . . . proclaim aloud the One God, whom man may know, adore and love; and Natural History must in good time become the analysis of the thoughts of the Creator of the Universe, as manifested in the animal and vegetable kingdoms as well as in the inorganic world".[13] While Agassiz lived, therefore, it was at least possible for the clergy to reject evolution as lacking sufficient confirmation if not entirely incorrect.

Even before Darwin's work was published, Agassiz had already formulated his views on transmutation. In 1845 he wrote to the English geologist, Adam Sedgwick:[14]

> The idea of a procreation of new species by preceding ones is a gratuitous supposition opposed to all sound physiological notions. And yet it is true that, taken as a whole, there is a gradation . . . of successive geological formations and that the end of this development is the appearence of man. But

[11] Louis Agassiz, On the Natural Provinces of the Animal World and their Relation to the Different Types of Man, in J. C. Nott and George R. Gliddon, *Types of Mankind; or Ethnological Researches* (Philadelphia, 1854), p. lviii; also his The Diversity of Origin of the Human Race, *Christian Examiner*, XIV. (July, 1850) 110; *Louis Agassiz: His Life and Correspondence*, Elizabeth Carey Agassiz, ed. (Boston, 1885), II. 497.

[12] John Fiske, Agassiz and Darwinism, *Pop. Sci. Mo.*, III. (Oct., 1873) 697; Thomas Smith, *The Unity of the Human Race proved to be the Doctrine of Scripture, Reason, and Science* (New York, 1850); Diversity of Species in the Human Race, *Bibl. Reper. and Pr. Rev.*, XXXIV. (July, 1862) 435; The Scepticism of Science, *ibid.*, XXXV. 61; Joseph P. Thompson, Quatrefages and Gordon in Reply to Agassiz on the Origin and Distribution of Mankind, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, XIX. (July, 1862) 607; J. M. Manning, *Half-Truths and the Truth: Lectures on the Origin and Development of Prevailing Forms of Unbelief considered in Relation to the Nature and Claims of the Christian System* (Boston, 1872), p. 18.

[13] Agassiz, *Classification*, p. 205.

[14] Agassiz, *Corr.*, I. 392; "I find it impossible to attribute the biological phenomena which have been and still are going on upon the surface of our globe, to the simple action of physical forces. I believe they are due, in their entirety, as well as individually, to the direct intervention of a creative power . . . " (*ibid.*, p. 389). "I think we know enough of comparative anatomy to abandon forever the idea of the transmutation of the organ of one type into those of another" (*ibid.*). Earlier in the year Sedgwick had written, "The opinions of Geoffry St. Hilaire and his dark school seem to be gaining ground in England. I detest them because I think them untrue. They shut out all argument from design and all notion of a Creative Providence . . . " (*ibid.*, pp. 383, 384). Sedgwick had written Darwin: "I have read your book with more pain than pleasure. Parts of it I admired greatly, parts I laughed at till my sides were almost sore; other parts I read with absolute sorrow, because I think them utterly false and grievously mischievous" (Darwin, *Life and Letters*, II. 248); see also pp. 91, 100.

this serial connection . . . is not material; taken singly these groups of species show no relation through intermediate forms genetically derived from the other. The connection between them becomes evident only when they are considered as a whole emanating from a creative power, the author of them all.

From this position the author never varied and when, in 1860, he reviewed the *Origin of Species* he insisted that the views there presented did not make the "slightest impression" upon his mind or in any way modify his former opinions.[15] He expressed his aversion to philosophical or scientific systems which appeared to rest on physical foundations and presented the scientific objections [16] which he regarded as destructive to the theory. In addition he arraigned Darwin and his followers for having violated the laws of thought. "If species do not exist at all . . . how can they vary and if individuals alone exist, how can the differences which may be observed prove the variability of species?" [17] He felt constrained, therefore, to adjudge Darwinism ". . . a scientific mistake, untrue in its facts, unscientific in its method, and mischievous in its tendency".[18] The progress of the new thought disturbed his tranquillity, but he remained confident that in the end the truth would conquer. "My recent studies", he wrote in 1867, "have made me more adverse than ever to the new scientific doctrines. . . . This sensational zeal reminds me of what I experienced as a young man in Germany, when the physio-philosophy of Oken had invaded every center of scientific activity; and yet, what is there left of it? I trust to outlive this mania also." [19]

Agassiz was approaching the end of his mortal career, but he prepared his last message on the subject of evolution before death claimed him.

[15] Professor Agassiz on the Origin of Species, *Am. Jour. of Sci.*, XXX. (July, 1860) 143; *Corr.*, II. 647.

[16] Agassiz's main scientific objection was based on geological evidence, a field in which he was well qualified to speak. If Darwin were correct the record would show the existence of transitional forms which, he asserted, was not the case. "The fact is that throughout all geological times each period is characterized by definite specific types, belonging to definite genera, and these to definite families, referable to definite orders, constituting definite classes and definite branches . . .". *Am. Jour. of Sci.*, XXX. 154.

[17] Agassiz was employing good philosophical logic which, to quote a modern writer, is all on the side of creationism while "evolution has only correctness to sustain it". Evolution cannot be demonstrated by a formal logic which does not encompass the idea of change. Horace M. Kallen, *Why Religion* (New York, 1927), pp. 15, 17.

[18] *Am. Jour. of Sci.*, XXX. 154.

[19] Tyndall reports Agassiz to have said in a manner which he describes as "earnestly, almost sadly", " 'I confess I was not prepared to see this theory received as it has been by the best intellects of our time. Its success is greater than I could have thought possible' ". John Tyndall, *Address delivered before the British Association assembled at Belfast* (New York, 1874), p. 49. Agassiz, *Corr.*, II. 647.

This final message took the form of an article in the *Atlantic Monthly* which was intended to be the first of a series refuting the current "mania". He had receded sufficiently from his initial position to distinguish the work of Darwin from that of his predecessors and his less cautious followers.[20] In fact, he was prepared to concede, as he had not been in the first hot flush of opposition, that Darwin would have ". . . treated his subject according to the best scientific methods had he not frequently overstepped the boundaries of actual knowledge and allowed his imagination to supply the links which science does not furnish". Beyond this he was unwilling to go. The transmutation of species was still as fallacious in 1873 as it had been thirteen years earlier. "It is not true that a slight variation . . . goes on increasing until the difference amounts to a specific distinction. On the contrary, it is a matter of fact that extreme variations finally degenerate or become sterile. . . ." Above all he resented the attitude of extreme Darwinians who apparently refused recognition to a divine agent by ridiculing the idea of special creation. "What of it, if it were true?" he asked, "Have those who object to repeated acts of creation ever considered that no progress can be made in knowledge without repeated acts of thinking? And what are thoughts but specific acts of the mind?"[21]

It is difficult to do justice to the influence of Agassiz as a factor in the controversy over evolution, much less overestimate it. Few men came in contact with his forceful personality without being impressed. His students revered him[22] and we have it from one at least, Professor Burt G. Wilder of Cornell University, that he became an evolutionist only "when forced to decide for himself what should be said to earnest and thoughtful students".[23] The care with which academicians guarded their scientific reputations, a factor which exasperated Darwin, is a consideration which should not be neglected in estimating the influence of Agassiz. The weight of his reputation doubtless prevented many, especially among the lesser men and those with incorrigible theological

[20] ". . . Darwin has placed the subject on a different basis from all his predecessors, and he has brought to the discussion a vast amount of well-arranged information, a convincing cogency of argument, and a captivating charm of presentation. His doctrine appealed the more powerfully to the scientific world because he maintained it at first not upon metaphysical ground but upon observation". *Atlantic Monthly*, XXXIII. (Jan., 1874) 94.

[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 94, 98, 101; *cf.* above, n. 18.

[22] To this statement there is one exception, see article on Henry James Clark, *Dictionary of American Biography.*

[23] Cornell University, *Proceedings at the Unveiling of the Tablet to the Memory of Louis Agassiz* (Ithaca, 1885), p. 25.

opinions, from indorsing Darwinism. It certainly restrained men of reticence from taking an active part in the controversy as was the case with Jeffries Wyman, the Harvard anatomist.[24] In general, Agassiz's opposition made an immediate acceptance of Darwin's views impossible,[25] thus making the years from 1859 to 1873 a probationary period in which transmutation was on trial before the bar of science. There were accordingly few precipitous flights of interpretation from which sober research would later demand a denial. Instead, American naturalists retired within their studies and prosecuted their labors with the added zest afforded by discussion. The results are best seen in the work of such men as Othniel Charles Marsh, Yale's paleontologist, whose efforts were later rewarded by Huxley's elaborate praise, or in the studies of Edward Drinker Cope and Alpheus Hyatt, who immediately accepted the central idea of the *Origin* but deserted natural selection in favor of Neo-Lamarckism.[26] But even Agassiz's opposition could not stem the flow of time and all scientists of note, Agassiz's son Alexander included, ultimately adopted the fundamental principle for which Darwin had labored.

To the beleaguered defenders of the outposts of orthodoxy, Agassiz appeared as a providential David. His rejection of any form of transmutation lent a color of respectability to the theological denunciation and long after his objections had been satisfactorily answered, many an unrelenting cleric continued to invoke his authority in support of the old theology.[27]

[24] *More Letters of Charles Darwin,* Francis Darwin, ed. (New York, 1903), I. 196; Burt G. Wilder, Jeffries Wyman, Anatomist, *Leading American Men of Science,* David Starr Jordan, ed. (New York, 1910), p. 193.

[25] Wesley R. Coe, A Century of Zoology in America, *A Century of Science in America* (New Haven, 1918), p. 410; Edward S. Morse, American Association for the Advancement of Science, *Proceedings,* XXV. (Aug., 1876) 140.

[26] John Fiske, A Century of Science, *Century of Science and Other Essays* (Boston, 1899), p. 25; *id.,* Darwinism Verified, *Darwinism and Other Essays* (Boston, 1913), pp. 27–28; Huxley, *Letters,* II. 203–205. Emanuel Radl, *History of Biological Theories* (London, 1930), pp. 274 ff.; Edward D. Cope, *On the Hypothesis of Evolution: Physical and Metaphysical* [University Series no. 4] (New Haven, 1870); also his collected essays on this aspect of the subject, *Origin of the Fittest: Essays on Evolution* (New York, 1887), which fully illustrate his point of view; Alpheus Hyatt, *American Naturalist,* IV. (June, 1870) 231–232; A. S. Packard, Alpheus Hyatt, *Proceedings* of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, XXXVIII. 722 ff.; for Darwin's reaction to the rehabilitation of Lamarckian principles, *More Letters,* I. 341–345.

[27] For further information on Agassiz's opposition see Professor and Mrs. Louis Agassiz, *A Journey to Brazil* (Boston, 1868), pp. 40–44; *Scientific American,* n. s., XXX. (Feb. 7, 1874) 85; Edward S. Morse, Jean Louis Roudolphe Agassiz, *Pop. Sci. Mo.,* LXXI. (Dec., 1907) 542 ff.; Andrew Dickson White, *History of the Warfare of Science with*

The history of Asa Gray's activity during the controversy presents almost an exact antithesis to that of Agassiz. While the latter denounced the doctrines contained in the *Origin* even before their publication, Gray adopted them immediately and became one of the leading exponents of Darwinism in America. Yet Gray was almost as unflinching a theist [28] as his great colleague but was possessed of greater "flexibility of mind" and a more happily adjusted perspective.

Born in Paris, New York, in 1810, Gray received the degree of Doctor of Medicine at the age of twenty-one. He soon relinquished practice to devote himself to botanical research and the teaching of natural history. His ability and distinction in this field did not long remain unnoticed and in 1842 he was appointed Fisher Professor of Natural History at Harvard, a position he held until 1873 when he voluntarily retired to devote himself entirely to research.[29] Gray and Darwin were professional acquaintances of long standing. This acquaintance, inspired originally by a similarity of interest, matured into a friendship continually strengthened by mutual respect and understanding of which a lively correspondence interrupted only by the death of Darwin was the result. The great English naturalist regarded Gray as the foremost American botanist [30] and submitted to him an account of his projected work in 1856. To Gray, therefore, probably belongs the distinction of being the first American scientist to have any previous knowledge of Darwin's researches.[31] He pronounced the work

Theology in Christendom (New York, 1896), I. 68–70 and n.; for an excellent statement of his views which is in some aspects an apologia written by his student, see Joseph Le Conte, Address, California Academy of Sciences, *Proceedings*, V. (1873) 220 ff., which is reprinted and greatly amplified in his later and much better known, *Evolution, its Nature, its Evidences, and its Relation to Religious Thought* (New York, 1891), pp. 32–49, and *passim;* Huxley, *Letters*, I. 181; Darwin, *Letters*, II. 63, 64, n., 80 and n., 103, 123, 152; *More Letters*, II. 160.

[28] Asa Gray, *Natural Science and Religion* (New York, 1880), lectures to the students at Yale Divinity School, *passim; Fifty Years of Darwinism* (New York, 1909), p. 28.

[29] The change came when he was invited to become assistant to Professor Torrey who was a member of the faculty of chemistry in the College of Physicians and Surgeons of New York but whose major interest was in botany. W. G. Farlow, Memoir of Asa Gray, National Academy of Sciences, *Memoirs*, III. 165. After 1873 he retained his university affiliation as director of the herbarium.

[30] *More Letters*, I. 169; an opinion shared by many others, John Fiske, *Edward Livingston Youmans: Interpreter of Science for the People* (New York, 1894), p. 281; William North Rice, *Christian Faith in an Age of Science* (New York, 1903), p. 252; Fiske, Guessing at Half and Multiplying by Two, *Century of Science*, p. 349.

[31] James Dwight Dana, Asa Gray, *Am. Jour. Sci.*, XXXV. (Mar., 1888) 196.

done in a "masterly manner"[32] and felt that Darwin had made out a better case than he had thought possible. Early in January, 1860, Gray wrote to Darwin's friend, J. D. Hooker, "As I have promised, he [Darwin] and you shall have fair play here. . . . I must myself write a review . . . for 'Silliman's Journal'[33] (the more so as I expect Agassiz means to come out upon it) . . . and I am now setting about it. . . . I doubt if I shall please you altogether. I know I shall not please Agassiz at all." But Gray was not yet a complete convert[34] though in his first review[35] he outlined the case for Darwinism and made a fervent plea for scientific tolerance. The review did not please him entirely and he felt some explanation to Darwin was necessary to justify its lack of enthusiasm. "It naturally happens", he wrote him, "that my review . . . does not exhibit anything like the full force of the impression the book has made upon me. Under the circumstances I suppose I do your theory more good here, by bespeaking for it a fair and favorable consideration. . . ."[36]

It was Gray's intention to rid Darwin's theory of its apparent materialism by showing that the concept of evolution by natural selection did not exclude design from nature. He was quick to recognize that Darwin

[32] Darwin, *Letters,* II. 62–63; Agassiz, when I saw him last, had read but a part of it. He says it is *poor—very poor!!* (entre nous) . . . he is very much annoyed by it . . . and I do not wonder . . . " (*ibid.,* 63); and indeed to please Gray the work had to be a "masterly" performance for he no less than other men of science had been a firm believer in the doctrine of immutability. His previous attitude may best be seen in the comments made anent the *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* (New York, 1845), a volume published anonymously now attributed to Robert Chambers. In two reviews of this gentleman's efforts Gray championed the current views in the best traditional manner, ". . . it is a revival of the old atheistic hypothesis . . . ", he said, and shows no improvement over the attempts of Democritus and Epicurus in either substance or purpose. It is "the most chimerical of all,—the gradual development of the higher orders of being out of those next beneath them in the scale", Theory of Creation, *North American Review,* LX. (Apr., 1845) 438, 457; nor was he more kindly disposed to *Explanations: a Sequel to the Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* (New York, 1846), remarking, "If anything has been settled by human observation, it would seem to be this,—the actual uniform production of each species of seed specifically after its kind", and ". . . species which are now fixed . . . have been so ever since their creation", Explanation of the Vestiges, *N. Am. Rev.,* LXII. (Apr., 1846) 471.

[33] Another name for the *American Journal of Science and Arts.*

[34] Darwin, *Letters,* II. 63; *Letters of Asa Gray,* Jane Loring Gray, ed. (Boston, 1893), II. 445, 457; George L. Goodale, The Development of Botany since 1818, *Century of Science,* 451.

[35] The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, *Am. Jour. of Sci.,* XXIX. (Mar., 1860) 153, reprinted in Gray, *Darwiniana* (New York, 1876), pp. 9 ff.; see also Darwin and his Reviewers, *Atlantic Monthly,* VI. (Oct., 1860) 406 ff.

[36] Gray, *Letters,* II. 457.

could not obtain a favorable hearing from theologians and devoutly religious men of science unless this were done. "I am determined", he wrote Darwin, "to baptize [the *Origin*] *nolens volens,* which will be its salvation. But if you won't have it done, it will be damned. . . ."[37] Gray accordingly proceeded to prevent its damnation by asserting that Darwin was free from any religious animus and that the theory itself left the problems of religion exactly where they had been before its advent, a method which was subsequently employed by all important reconcilers.

Gray's method had a twofold object. He had first to render Darwinism respectable by ridding "natural selection", "contrivance", and "survival of the fittest" of their obnoxious naturalistic connotations. This was necessary in order to soothe the doubts of scientists and theologians alike that evolution was atheistic in its tendency.[38] He must then assure the timid naturalist that a belief in transmutation was reasonable and convince the suspicious cleric that theology would not suffer by its acceptance.

Gray's principal contention was that Darwin's work, despite its title, did not pretend to account for the origin of life "but for its diversification into the forms and kinds which we now behold".[39] The mystery of creation, of a first cause, vaguely remained "in the beginning" as of old

[37] Discussion between Two Readers of Darwin's Treatise on the Origin of Species, upon its Natural Theology, *Am. Jour. of Sci.,* XXX. (Sept., 1860) 226–239, reprinted in *Darwiniana,* pp. 62–86. "The important thing to do, is to develop aright evolutionary teleology, and to present the argument for design from these exquisite adaptations in such a way as to make it tell on both sides with Christian men, that they may be satisfied with, and perchance may learn to admire, Divine works effected step by step . . . in a system of nature; and the antitheistic people, to show that without the implication of a superintending wisdom nothing is made out, and nothing credible". *Letters,* II. 479–480, 656; see Hooker's comment on Gray's attitude in a letter to Huxley, Huxley's *Letters,* II. 205.

[38] So intent was he in this purpose that even after Darwinism had successfully weathered the first storm of opposition, he wrote his friend Rev. G. F. Wright (see below, *Letters,* II. 659) that he had seen references to St. Augustine which seemed to indicate a belief in an indirect creation ". . . such as now would be termed . . . evolutionary", and desired to be referred to appropriate sources the better to present his case to doubting theologians. Farlow, National Academy of Sciences, *Memoirs,* III. 172.

[39] Gray, *Natural Science and Religion,* p. 47; Farlow, National Academy of Sciences, *Memoirs,* III. 172; *Atlantic Monthly,* XLVI. (Aug., 1880) 274; Evolution and Theology, *Nation,* XVIII. (Jan. 15, 1874) 45, wherein Gray chides theologians who regard the theory of evolution as a premeditated attack against religion and berates them for their "lack of familiarity with prevalent ideas and their history", reprinted in *Darwiniana,* 254; *Natural Selection not Inconsistent with Theology* (London, 1861), *passim,* which appeared separately in the *Atlantic Monthly* in July, August, and October, 1860 (vol. VI.), and were later republished under this title.

and had no relation to the subjects then in controversy. The question was, merely, is derivation scientifically true and if so, does it endanger religion? In answer to the first, Gray concluded affirmatively urging that it was a problem which must be weighed in the scales of science and one which could not be dismissed because obnoxious to theologians. As to the second, there could be no dispute, if the major premise were conceded, for, as he said, "Agreeing that plants and animals were produced by Omnipotent fiat does not exclude the idea of natural order and what we call secondary causes".[40]

Gray's support was admirably timed. It coincided almost exactly with Agassiz's opposition and did much to counterbalance it. Although conjecture is admittedly unsatisfactory, it is reasonably safe to conclude that given Agassiz and no Gray it would have been very difficult for Darwin to have obtained so ready a hearing in this country. It was Gray who braved Agassiz's opposition and prepared the ground for an ultimate acceptance of evolutionary views.

Darwin, who was keenly appreciative of so stalwart a defender, wrote, "I declare that you know my book as well as I do myself; and bring to the question new lines of illustration and argument in a manner which excites my astonishment and almost my envy! . . . Every single word seems weighed carefully, and tells like a 32-pound shot" which, as the late Professor Dorsey remarked, was quite a shot for those days.[41]

Gray was accused by a certain unknown minister from Illinois of abetting confusion and unrest by advocating such disturbing views,[42] but a more accurate index of his influence in theological circles may be gleaned from his friendship with George Frederick Wright, professor at Oberlin Theological Seminary. Wright, who was also a geologist, made the reconciliation of science and religion the main work of his life. In 1875, he prepared a series of articles for the *Bibliotheca Sacra* on the compatability of Darwinism and design[43] in which he enlisted the aid

[40] Darwin and his Reviewers, *Atlantic Monthly*, VI. 406.

[41] *Letters*, II. 119; George A. Dorsey, *The Evolution of Charles Darwin* (New York, 1927), p. 135.

[42] Speaking of this man Gray said, "He is one of those people who think that if you shut your eyes hard, it will answer every purpose; indeed from the ease with which he confutes Darwinism, I suppose he finds no call even to shut his eyes". *Letters*, II. 657; see White, *Warfare*, I. 79, for similar cases.

[43] *The Ice Age of North America* (New York, 1889); *Man and the Glacial Period* (New York, 1892); *Story of My Life and Work* (Oberlin, 1916), pp. vii, viii, 137–138; Divine Method of producing Living Species, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, XXXIII. 448; Objections to Darwinism and the Rejoinders of its Advocates, *ibid.*, p. 656; see also, Some Analogies between Calvinism and Darwinism, *ibid.*, XXXVII. 48; these are all subtitles in a series bearing the general heading Recent Works bearing on the Relation of Science to Religion.

of Gray. Their friendship born of the controversy was nurtured by it and they were drawn increasingly closer by mutual undertakings.[44]

By reason of his church affiliations, Wright was enabled to carry Gray's version of Darwin's message to the innermost precincts of orthodoxy from which Gray, by reason of his notoriety as a champion of Darwinism, was sometimes barred. Wright, despite his scientific avocation, was much more orthodox than Gray and was encouraged to go to greater lengths by the latter's substantial theism.

The third member of the group, James Dwight Dana, occupied a position midway between that of Agassiz and Gray. He took no part in the controversy itself but his conversion from opposition to any form of transmutation to an avowal of belief in the origin of species by descent, is symptomatic of the change which took place in the minds of many naturalists of whose intellectual lives we have no record.[45] Dana succeeded Benjamin Silliman as professor of geology at Yale and held the chair which bears the name of that distinguished pioneer in American science.

Like Agassiz, Dana was deeply awed by the sublimities of nature whose mysteries became clear only when interpreted in terms of an all-comprehending creative genius. His scientific prowess and lovable character endeared him to his colleagues and students while his resolute but unobtrusive religious faith earned undying favor among the clergy.[46]

[44] Wright prepared the index for Gray's *Darwiniana* and dedicated his later *Studies in Science and Religion* (Andover, 1882), to the Harvard botanist; see above, n. 38.

[45] Another scientist whose conversion was similar to Dana's but whose fame was far less widespread was Alexander Winchell, professor of geology at the University of Michigan and at one time (1873) chancellor of Syracuse University, who at first only accepted the concept of evolution as applied to the physical world, *The Doctrine of Evolution and its Theistic Bearings* (New York, 1874, p. 27); he eschewed derivation but admitted that there was a plan or method of evolution (p. 36), and cited all the stock arguments against it (pp. 31, 57 ff.); four years later he still felt that the derivation of all species was a "somewhat hazardous assumption", *Reconciliation of Science and Religion* (New York, 1877, p. 252), but admitted in a note added subsequently that the evidence had all but broken down the "barriers to an acceptance of the derivative hypothesis" (*ibid.*); and finally, Grounds and Consequences of Evolution, *Sparks from a Geologist's Hammer* (Chicago, 1881), he said, "We now think it safer to accept the hypothesis than to reject it" (p. 333), and therewith commenced devoting his efforts to accommodate the fundamentals of theism to modern science.

[46] D. C. Gilman, *Life of James Dwight Dana* (New York, 1899), pp. 8, 179 ff. Dana's record in the service of religion was a brilliant one. He followed in the footsteps of his predecessor who had dealt such courteous but telling thrusts against Moses Stuart of the Andover Theological Seminary in the early conflict over geology. Gilman, pp. 161–162, 182; White, *Warfare*, I. 209–248. He continued the argument with those who upheld the literal interpretation of Genesis as against the results of geological discovery, notably with Dr. Tayler Lewis, an eminent Presbyterian divine, Gilman, p. 183. In these

When the *Origin* first appeared, Dana was away recuperating from an illness and the duty of reviewing it for the *American Journal of Science and Arts* of which he was editor in chief devolved upon Asa Gray. Dana's illness and accumulating labors did not permit the reading of Darwin's work until well into 1863.[47] The fact itself is not without significance. Had Dana, religious man that he was, felt his faith endangered by the scientific speculation over the *Origin,* he would doubtless have rushed to the volume to discover its secrets. But so certain was he as to the ultimate truth of his convictions that his attention was not even distracted by the debate which raged about him.

With Agassiz, Dana shared a belief in some form of evolution. His geological researches inclined him to an acceptance of development in the physical world which he regarded as the product of natural law.[48] He believed the organic kingdom to be the direct work of the Creator who planned and evolved it by successively prearranged steps. He indorsed the current scientific faith in immutability and had already expressed his opinion that a species was ". . . a specific amount or condition of concentered force, defined in the act or law of creation".[49] Gray rightly anticipated that one who held this view could hardly be expected to welcome a theory such as Darwinism.[50]

There was, therefore, a multiplicity of factors which united to prevent Dana from becoming an ardent advocate of derivation and his

articles he displayed the blessedness of humility and the fatuity of unreasoned dogmatism. As a result, his name was known to many who, even if unable to share his views, could deny neither his theism nor his Christianity.

[47] On December 4, 1862, Dana wrote to Darwin, "Many long months, and now even years, have passed by, and still your book, the *Origin,* remains unopened". Gilman, p. 311. On February 5, 1863, he wrote to Darwin, "I have still to report your book unread", *ibid.,* p. 313. It should be noted that Dana's scientific views were just as secure as his religious convictions and the fact that he had not read his Darwin gave him no reason to believe that the *Origin* was in any way superior to Lamarck.

[48] See an appraisal of Dana by LeConte printed in full in Gilman, p. 254, but note that Dana's development meant no more than the unfolding of a divine plan. He was not even a complete uniformitarian in his early years and his interpretation of geological history left ample room for many catastrophes. That, of course, did not preclude a belief in development for each catastrophe was but a step in the creative purpose. He gradually relinquished these ideas, however. William North Rice, The Geology of James Dwight Dana, *Dana Commemorative Lectures: Problems of American Geology* (New Haven, 1915), p. 1, and *passim.* See also Rice, James D. Dana, Geologist, in Jordan, *American Men of Science,* pp. 249–250; Charles Schuchert, A Century of Geology: the Progress of Historical Geology in North America, *Century of Science,* pp. 109 ff.

[49] Dana, Thoughts on Species, *Am. Jour. of Sci.,* XXIV. (Nov., 1857) 306.

[50] *N. Am. Rev.,* XCVII. (Oct., 1863) 372, a masterly review of the *Manual of Geology,* in which Asa Gray succinctly brings out most of the points discussed above.

ultimate conversion is consequently the more remarkable.[51] When the *Origin* appeared Dana was no longer a young man and his opinions in such matters were somewhat fixed. He was trained in that school of Christian apologetics which found the best evidences of divinity in frequent interruptions of the cosmic scheme,[52] a theory for which he found ample confirmation in his scientific and philosophical opinions.

Dana continued to lecture to his classes at Yale on the errors of transmutation and as late as the 1870 edition of the *Manual* he was still of the belief that the attempt to establish evolution was "vain". "There are no lineal series through creation", he wrote, "corresponding to such methods of development".[53] During the next four years, however, he became less certain of these doctrines and admitted that the conclusion ". . . most likely to be sustained by further research"[54] was that one to which he had previously objected. He was now prepared to say that "The evolution of the system of life went forward through the derivation of species from species, according to natural methods not yet clearly understood, and with few occasions for supernatural intervention". But it was not until the last edition of the *Manual* that he entirely capitulated[55] and it will ever remain a tribute to the plasticity of his intellect

[51] Even Darwin himself did not expect it, "pray do not suppose that I think for one instant that, with your strong and slowly acquired convictions . . . you could have been converted. The utmost that I could have hoped would have been that you might possibly have been here or there staggered". Darwin to Dana, Gilman, p. 315.

[52] *Dana Commemorative Lectures*, p. 6.

[53] Dana, *Synopsis of Geological Lectures in Yale College* (New Haven), lecture XXI., pt. iv, nos. 8, 16, 17. Dana, *Manual of Geology: Treating of the Principles of the Science with Special Reference to American Geological History* (New York, 1870), still maintained that the "extermination of species was in general due to catastrophes . . .", and that "Geology appears to bring us directly before the Creator . . . it leads to no other solution of the great problem of creation, whether of kinds of matter or of species of life, than this:—DEUS FECIT", pp. 601, 602; also *cf.* 398, 573 ff.

[54] James D. Dana, *A Text-Book of Geology* (New York, 1874), p. 263, in which he also appeared to throw some doubt upon his previous catastrophic beliefs by admitting the conception of gaps in the geological record, pp. 259–260.

[55] *Manual* (New York, 1874), pp. 603–604; but he hastened to add in a footnote, "There is here no discordance with the Biblical account of Creation . . . "; he still refused to include man within the evolutionary chain because ". . . gifted with high reason and will, and thus made a power above Nature, there was required, as Wallace has urged, the special act of a Being above Nature . . .". From this he finally receded (see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LII., July, 1895, p. 558), where a letter to the Rev. John G. Hall is published which came to light only after Dana's death (Apr. 14, 1895), and was cited in this instance to show that one could accept evolution completely and still remain orthodox. This is the more important for some have chosen to misinterpret the statement in the final edition of the *Manual* (New York, 1895), p. 1036, in which the objection of Wallace is restated, as in the edition of 1874, but with the qualification that,

and robust manhood that he was able to pass from one extreme to the other with such grace and candor.

Dana's importance is not derived from the part he played in the controversy itself but rather from his historical position. His influence was limited to a relatively small circle of students and friends who looked to his scientific works for guidance. He made no such widespread appeal as the two Harvard professors whose influence extended far beyond the university lecture hall and laboratory.

BERT JAMES LOEWENBERG.

Boston.

although the creative power ordained it, it was nevertheless the culmination of the evolutionary process. In the last edition he said, "The principles . . . are all in accord with a theory of evolution; and, through the added facts of later years, they favor the view of *evolution by natural variation*", p. 1030. But he adds, after discussing Lamarck and his modern followers, Cope, Hyatt, and others, that natural selection is not the sole cause of evolution which may even occur without it, pp. 1033, 1036.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

The Founders of New England

I.

The area which we know as New England was better entitled to the name in colonial times than any other group of American provinces, but its people were neither so strongly nor so typically English as generally assumed. The problem of their origins, as well as the origins of other American colonists, has recently been the subject of an elaborate report published by the American Historical Association.[1] This report left the antecedents of many settlers in the New England area uninterpreted, although it was remarkably successful in determining the origins of other early Americans. The authors approached the problem through an analysis of the population in 1790, the year of the first Federal census, selected on account of the importance of this population group and the relative lack of information concerning it. Although there were only 3,200,000 white people in the United States at that time, they are responsible, through their descendants, for nearly one-half of the present white population of the country.

The committee properly placed its emphasis on interpretation of family names and local histories. Professor Marcus L. Hansen was the committee's historical associate and traced the minor stocks and made records of outlying settlements. I carried out complementary studies of family names to develop estimates of the major stocks, namely, the English, Irish, Scotch, and German. Our reports provide the basis for the committee's conclusions.

While more than two-thirds of the people of President Washington's time had traditions of English ancestry, these are not always easily verified. Many American genealogies, to this day, do not go beyond the original settler, in spite of years of effort to establish his European home. By the end of the colonial period many American families had been in this country so many generations that they made little point of their ancestry. Their reputedly English names were often the common prop-

[1] Report of the Committee on Linguistic and National Stocks in the Population of the United States, American Council of Learned Societies, *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association for the year 1931 (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1932), I. 103–408.

erty of Englishmen, Scots, and Irishmen, or—quite as often—rare or unknown in England. Because of these circumstances, the proportion of English among the colonists must be established with the same care as that of other blood strains.

My estimates of Scotch, Irish, and German heredity were based on measurements of usage of distinctive surnames, and similar measurements should be applicable to the appraisal of the English stock. Every people has definite nomenclatural traits and can be recognized by certain common names not used by other people. The English are no exception. It has been shown by recognized authorities that the fifty surnames which they use most frequently account for eighteen per cent. of all Englishmen and that twenty-two of these appellations which are rarely borne by other people account for eight per cent. of the nationality. Since these names are both commonly and regularly used by the English, the numbers of their bearers in a mixed settlement should constitute a definite index of English blood, and are so construed in the report.[2]

Distinctively English names like *Hall, Parker, Jones,* and *Williams* do not now seem to have a national flavor, but that is mainly because the whole cloth of American life has an English weave. Such names are as distinctive of the English as *Buchanan, Duncan, Robertson,* and *McPherson* are of the Scotch, or *Murphy, Farrell, Connor,* and *Doherty* of the Irish.

Only two important, although exceptional, factors were thought to color the interpretation of distinctive English names: Their fairly frequent use in place of non-English designations in the course of general Anglicization of the population, and the differences between the two areas, Anglican or Cambrian,[3] into which England is divided according to nomenclatural traits. When due allowance is made for the second factor, and it is found that the colonists made seven-tenths as much use of the indicative designations as the English did, it would seem that the English were approximately seventy per cent. of the colonial population. But let us compare the detail of that rating with the result reached by subtracting the non-English.

The following table shows the results of measuring the usage of distinctive English names compared with the results obtained by deducting the readily recognizable non-English from the total population of the New England states.[4]

[2] See pp. 113, 164–205.

[3] See p. 705.

[4] *Cf.* Table 11, p. 122 of Report.

AREA	Estimate of English obtained by deducting readily recognizable non-English from total population	Maximum English indicated by usage of distinctively English surnames	Discrepancy
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
Maine	81	60	—21
New Hampshire	85	61	—24
Vermont	89	76	—13
Massachusetts	90	82	— 8
Rhode Island	90	71	—19
Connecticut	93	67	—26

In some states of the early republic the usage of English names was deficient and in others excessive. The "deficient" group includes the New England states with Delaware; the "excessive" group the other nine states. The excesses are mainly explained by non-English adoption of English designations. Revision of the preliminary figures to allow for voluntary usage of English names indicates that there was an element not readily assignable by nationality throughout the colonial population.

For the situation in New England there are only three explanations possible: That the supposedly distinctive names are not good indicators of English blood; that one or more non-English stocks has been decidedly underestimated; or that the type of Englishmen which converged on New England had a remarkably high ratio of uncommon names.

II.

First, as to the indicative value of the names studied. Tracing the frequencies of common names is something quite different from merely sorting names of high and low degree according to supposed background. While there are to-day some 35,000 surnames used in England and the number may have been quite as great two or three hundred years ago, the bulk of eighteenth century Englishmen were enrolled under some four thousand designations and the more common of these were of regular and almost universal distribution throughout the country. While the frequencies of individual names cannot be anticipated with more than "tolerable certainty", they have almost constant ratios in numerous lists when taken in groups.[5] Unless there was a breach in the customs of the English or a selective process in operation, the usage

[5] *Family Nomenclature in England and Wales,* Sixteenth Annual Report of the Registrar-General (London, 1856).

of these names in colonial times should give definite indication of English heritage.

Colonial Americans, like the English, concentrated under a comparatively few names. Of 27,000 family designations in the 1790 record, it requires less than 4000 to account for seven-eighths of the people. All of the distinctive English surnames were among those highly common. The twenty-two names given special consideration averaged use by nearly a thousand families each in the area of record from Maine to South Carolina, and by 334 families each in New England. Over thirty thousand people among the bare million who then peopled New England used one or the other of these designations in its exact English form.

The proportions of English which they seem to indicate form a rather smooth series in two parts. They ascend from Georgia to North Carolina and decline northward to Pennsylvania—with a high point in North Carolina which is partly an index of blood and partly of Anglicization. Northward and eastward from Pennsylvania they rise steadily in New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts, and decline again northward—with a peak in Massachusetts where typical English of these designations were evidently more than twice as numerous as in Pennsylvania. Throughout the Southern and Middle states as far north as Pennsylvania there is decided consistency in the ratios of the several names, but in New York irregularities appear which continue into New England and become more pronounced.

One of the major possibilities in misinterpreting the indicators is avoided by treating them in two classes called Anglican and Cambrian. The latter consists of names, illustrated by *Jones* and *Williams,* especially common in Wales and southwestern England where little variety in family designations prevailed. The former consists of names, illustrated by *Hall* and *Parker,* characteristic of normally varied English nomenclature from north to south but especially in the east. This classification shows that people with Cambrian, or what might be called Welsh-English cognomens, were less prone to migrate to the New World than were those with Anglican names, and the two-fold division of the English is recognized in summation.

A difficult question is whether the formal spellings of English names did not develop gradually during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was only in the latter part of the eighteenth century that general accuracy in spelling—for word and phrase—became the vogue. At first sight it would seem that certain name spellings must have gradually increased in popularity among the English-Americans, but

every argument along this line is denied by consistencies in the usage of standard versions of the indicative names.

The colonists have been suspected of making many willful variations in their appellations. Ernest Weekley, the eminent English etymologist and nomenclaturist, says: "In 1790 one is struck by the prevalence of crude and grotesque nicknames, often obvious preversions of foreign names, but frequently, no doubt, deliberately assumed by or conferred on men who had cut even the surnominal tie with Europe."[6] This situation is not especially unusual, however, as William Farr, the statistician, says concerning English records themselves: "Some of the terms which swell the list are so odd and even ridiculous that it is difficult to assign any satisfactory reason for their assumption in the first instance as family names . . . ."[7] As a matter of fact, the early New Englanders had a considerable penchant for discretionary spellings of surnames and were not nearly as prone to use established designations as were the Southerners centering in North Carolina. This may partly explain the apparent uncommonness of the distinctive forms and is of sufficient importance to be brought up later in another connection.

The real difficulty in applying a system of distinctive names to the measurement of English blood in New England is that the best studies of nomenclatural usage in the motherland are in insufficient detail and of comparatively late date. They are not as satisfactory as those of Scotch, Irish, or German usage. There is still much that needs to be known about English nomenclature in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries before the early practice of English-Americans in identifying themselves can be described with assurance.

III.

Who besides English settled in New England and in what measure, are the next questions. If the other newcomers had arrived in groups they would be fairly easy to detect by historical evidence and also by their names, but individual arrival is another matter. No non-English stock could have acquired substantial numbers in the American colonies without being mentioned by contemporary historians. What needs to be checked first, therefore, is the estimates of well-known stocks—Scotch, Irish, French, Dutch, German, and Swedish.

In New England there were no Swedish settlements and only one important German one. The Swedes who reached the area filtered

[6] *Surnames*, reprinted (New York, 1927), pp. 8–9.

[7] *Op. cit.*, n. 5, p. xvii.

northward from New Jersey and Delaware and were few. Only in Rhode Island did they constitute a noticeable fraction of a per cent. Germans in New England in groups large enough to call settlements seem to be liberally estimated at four thousand, of whom twelve hundred were in or near the Waldoborough cluster in Maine. This gives them a rating of 1.3 per cent. in Maine and less than a half of one per cent. elsewhere—a finding in definite contrast to the estimate of eight per cent. in New York.

The Dutch of the New Netherlands did not work eastward from the Hudson to any great degree except along the Sound. Practically none were known in New Hampshire or Maine and a large part of the others were traders or runaway servants. To rate them as a five hundredth of New England's population seems to be fair; there is a little possibility of understatement on account of changes of name which the historian Pearson [8] says were prevalent until about 1675.

The French in the area were not mainly from Canada for the *habitants* penetrated only a few regions on the border, principally Maine, the upper Connecticut Valley, and the Lake Champlain district. Some were the scattered Acadians. A few were the lately arrived French professional people. Most were Huguenots. Before the Revolution they are variously estimated to have numbered between one hundred and fifty and five thousand families, with the historians Palfrey and Fosdick taking extreme views. Dr. Hansen says: "But these variations are accounted for in part by differing judgments as to what is or is not a Huguenot. How, for instance, should these families be classified that had lived two or more generations in England before departing across the Atlantic?" [9] Those that had one or two generations of residence in England were, in our opinion, English and I shall refer to them later in that connection. For the others, Dr. Hansen's estimate of 1770 families, or slightly more than one per cent. of the population in 1790, may be correct, but it seems low because it is equivalent to only about twelve hundred families before the Revolution, and to a still smaller number at the time of immigration.

We now turn to the Scotch and Irish stocks forming definite settlements. The Highland Scotch and the southern Irish are comparatively easy to recognize by their names, but this is not true of the Lowlanders and some of the Ulsterites, nor even of the English Leinsterites. Slight modifications of their appellations enabled these people to pass as Eng-

[8] Jonathan Pearson, *Early Records . . . of Albany* (Albany, 1869).

[9] *Report*, p. 382.

lish if they did not already have designations of English style. The southern Irish were certainly not numerously represented in the area in 1790 because their distinctive names occur erratically, and to estimate them at about one and a half per cent., with a range from less than one per cent. in Rhode Island to nearly four per cent. in Maine, is more than most historians would expect. The Ulster Irish had several definite settlements, especially in Maine and New Hampshire, and appear to have been about twice as numerous as the southern Irish, reaching eight per cent. in Maine. Scotch names occur with considerable regularity in the records of our Northern states other than Connecticut and indicate over four per cent. of the nationality in New England's population. There may be some question as to whether they came via Ireland, but the Scotch appellations cannot be mistaken.

There is nothing on the face of the foregoing estimates of non-English to close the gap left when the estimate of typical English is added to them. As far as non-English people settling in groups are concerned, all except possibly the French and the Ulster Irish seem to have been allowed for adequately. The Scotch-Irish from Ulster and the French can make claims to greater percentages than have so far been ascribed to them, but hardly in degrees to dispose of many of the Yankee forefathers so far unaccountable.

We must now turn to the possibilities of infusion of non-English as individuals through contact with the other colonies and of infiltration from across the Atlantic. History records migrations of New Englanders outward to Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, and elsewhere, but no important reverse movement in colonial times. There were, however, campaigns in the French and Indian wars which drew the young men northward as the Revolution drew them southward. The activity of Yankee skippers from the Grand Banks to the West Indies and across the Atlantic can also be charged with a fair influence on population, accounting for sundry individuals from various points. These persons would not all have been English but would have seemed so if they spoke the language well. Their seemingly English names do not destroy the probability of non-English origin.

Felt's census records of Massachusetts, taken in 1777, designate more than one per cent. of the males capable of bearing arms as "strangers".[10] The absorption of this proportion of strangers would go far toward accounting for the unknown population in the states of the group sur-

[10] Joseph B. Felt, *Collections of the American Statistical Association* (Boston, 1847), vol. I., pt. II., p. 165.

rounding Massachusetts if the flow continued, as seems probable, for a number of decades, and if they did not ordinarily bear characteristic English names but only names which seemed English.

In the light of such conditions it is probable that a definite but moderate proportion of New England's founders were non-English people, not recognized as such because they already spoke the language, because they were British or naturalized by one process or another, and had names no more unusual than many which come from England.

IV.

The proportion of Yankee forefathers still unaccounted for, with appellations not characteristically English, also finds part of its explanation in the nature of English emigration. Let us consider this from the standpoints of social class, region of origin, and type of people involved.

The migrants were mostly of small or moderate means and possessed few noble names. This was also true of the other colonists. Guppy [11] has shown that the English gentry and humbler people make about equal use of common designations such as those used as indexes. So the settlers in the North did not get their uncommon names by being poor; but they were dissenters and separatists in religion and probably in other matters, including nomenclature. Their baptismal names often verged on the ridiculous. After they reached our shores they developed an unusual number of variant surname designations, as an examination of the catalogues of Savage, Dexter, Holmes, and others will show. They were of independent fiber not quite typical of the motherland's population.

This social peculiarity, however, was no more important in the evolution of the Yankee strain than was the influence of their geographic background. There are two important reasons for believing that the main body of New Englanders were drawn from more limited regions of England than were the English colonists as a whole. It is known that a goodly proportion of the Puritans were from eastern and southern England [12] and it can be shown that the heads of families in 1790 favored Anglican names in contrast to Cambrian.

The area from which Cambrian names spring comprises Wales, Monmouth, Gloucester, Shropshire, and Hereford—the southwestern part of the dual domain. *Jones* and *Williams* are the outstanding

[11] Henry B. Guppy, *Homes of Family Names in Great Britain* (London, 1890).

[12] Charles O. Paullin, *Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States* (Baltimore, 1932), plates 70C and 70D.

patronyms in the simple Cambrian nomenclature and were, with other names of like background, relatively uncommon in New England. The normal English ratio is two bearers of Cambrian designations to each nine bearing Anglican and this ratio was fairly well maintained in the states of 1790 from New York south, but in New England the ratio was less than one to ten. *Lewis,* the most common Cambrian patronym in New England, and *Philipps,* the most common one in Massachusetts, may both be suspected of French usage additional to the Welsh-English. If the Cambrian rate of migration had applied to all of the English going to New England, the stock would not have constituted more than a third of the population of the area.

The counterbalance must be found in a rapid rate of migration on the part of certain groups of Anglicans. Their nomenclature being much more varied than the Cambrian is harder to analyze. The outstanding fact available so far is that Anglican designations diverged widely in ratios of Yankee usage. The proportion of *Parkers, Halls,* and *Bakers* indicates several times as many Anglicans as does the proportion of *Coopers, Turners,* and *Robinsons,* but these designations were so largely used in eastern and central England from north to south that slight clew is offered as to the parts of England most connected with migration to New England.

The types of people indicated by the Anglican-Cambrian classification are more important than the regional backgrounds. People with Cambrian patronyms are ordinarily Welsh or mixed Welsh and English, and represent, in general, the ancient Brythonic type which gave its name to Britain. Their reluctance to migrate is highly significant, and makes it worth while to trace the flow of migration into England to see if there was a reversal in the outward movement.

The Brythonic peoples were driven westward and northward by the invading Angles and Saxons, and the descendants of the survivors of the two stocks were raided and partially displaced by the Scandinavians, soon followed, as the centuries go, by the Norman French who established themselves in overlordship. From the Norman Conquest on, there was invasion without bloodshed, and, after the opening of the sixteenth century, large migrations of Flemings, Dutch, Walloons, French, and Germans traceable to religious persecutions in Germany, France, and the Low Countries. This movement came to be dominated by the French and reached its climax after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, when it has been estimated that half a million French people were driven abroad and that a hundred thousand took refuge in England and Ireland.

Let us set up for subsequent testing the presumption that the element in New England heretofore unaccountable was largely composed of English having French or Low Country blood. The answer will not necessarily come from purely historical records because people who had been settled in England for many years may not have left a record of hyphenation, as Theodore Roosevelt called it. Study of their names will tell pretty clearly, but the proper materials are not yet at hand. The official English study [13] is rudimentary and of too late date. Guppy's work on the *Homes of Family Names in Great Britain* is based on name usage of the yeoman class which received few accessions after the Norman Conquest had become effective. The Anglicization of Low Country and Huguenot names has not yet been thoroughly investigated. We know, for example, that *Detray* may stand for *D'Estrees, Money* for *le Moyne, Phillips* for *Philippe,* and *Darling* for *D'Orleans,* but we lack a comprehensive story of these transitions comparable, let us say, with L. Oscar Kuhns's work on early German and Swiss designations.[14]

Three factors, however, strongly support our presumption: The partial disappearance of these sub-stocks in England, some evidence of their remigration after several generations of residence, and an agreement in the timing of probable developments.

The French migrants who fled almost directly to the New World have been recognized in the estimates of the French in colonial New England, but those that became naturalized English have not yet been considered, nor have the Walloons, Flemings, Dutch, and Germans who were associated with them. Several English authorities have noted the disappearance of Low Country and French names from English records. In his popular book, *The Story of Surnames,*[15] Bowman says: "It seems difficult to understand why so few foreign names are to be found in the Directories." "It is remarkable that the majority of these are German, and that the countries, France and Flanders, which have done more than any other to swell our census returns are but poorly represented." He presumes that they became thoroughly Anglicized, but should bear in mind his observation that "the people looked upon them with jealousy and suspicion, and as interlopers who had come to steal away their bread".

The fact that Huguenots who promptly migrated to the New World were rejoined by others who had tried to be content in Europe, especially England, accounts for part of the disagreement between Palfrey and

[13] *Op. cit.,* n. 5.

[14] L. Oscar Kuhns, *Studies in Pennsylvania German Family Names* (New York, 1902).

[15] William Dodgson Bowman, *The Story of Surnames* (New York, 1931).

Fosdick which has been referred to as bearing on the count of Huguenot settlers in New England. Since the economic position of the Low Country people was similar to that of the Huguenots in England, the two stocks can be looked upon as forming one element of lately naturalized English likely to migrate to the New World. This element would also include some Germans.

The element in New England which had seemed unaccountable entered the country some time between 1650 and 1750. It was not involved in the nuclear settlement in eastern Massachusetts where the ratio of people with distinctive English surnames was high. It possibly had its beginning in the latter part of the exodus of some five thousand families from England before the Puritan supremacy, but it did not continue far into the eighteenth century. The later phase, it will be noted, agrees very closely with the movement of the Huguenots beginning in 1685.

The special nomenclature of New England was established by 1750. The census of 1790 shows, for New England other than Maine, so few names borne by single families as to prove that settlement had practically ceased some time before. In the five states other than Maine, only about a third of the family names were borne by single families, when, in the rest of the country, this ratio was more nearly a half. Outsiders came into Maine throughout the eighteenth century, but Vermont which was also settled late got little new blood. In New England, generally and especially in Massachusetts, the number of families per name was relatively high and indicates a definite amalgamation of the population early in the colonial period with smaller additions in the latter part of the eighteenth century than were experienced in the Middle and Southern states.

The low ratios of distinctive English names in New England and the almost universal English tradition combine with the circumstances just stated to indicate that the perplexing element in New England was largely composed of people who were English by naturalization before migration, French, Walloon, Dutch, and Flemish in blood, and closely affiliated with the Huguenot migration.

V.

Colonial New England was England's stepchild. Its people were not so English as they have seemed and yet they were more largely English than their relatively scant usage of common English surnames would indicate. Some of these people were only near-English—natural-

ized sailors, fishermen, soldiers, and travelers. Many of them were *new* English—the descendants of people who had settled in England not many years before the removal to America.

The exodus from England to some extent reversed that country's original peopling, the last to come being first to go. New England received few of the Cambrian and other indigenous types and many of the descendants of the refugees which England sheltered in modern times.

As was the case elsewhere in Europe during this period, the indigenous people of England stayed on while those who had but recently migrated, moved again. Circumstances directed the *new* English northward and gave New England a population quite at contrast with that in the Southern states where the English were more typical and more clearly mixed with foreigners.

Massachusetts was one center and Virginia another of two English colonizations which were almost separated by the German and Irish dominion in Pennsylvania. Around the hub in Massachusetts formed an aggregation of exiles devoted to individuality, which contrasted sharply with the more conformable group centering on Virginia, and of striking importance in North Carolina. Up the Connecticut Valley and eastward in New Hampshire and Maine were colonists who were anything but conformists. In their self-reliance and pride in being unique lies one of the explanations of the civil war which occurred within seventy years of the close of the colonial period.

HOWARD F. BARKER.

Washington, D. C.

DOCUMENTS

Adam Smith on the American Revolution: an Unpublished Memorial

THE Rosslyn MSS. in the William L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan, contain official and other papers that were in the possession of Alexander Wedderburn, solicitor-general in Lord North's administration, and one of the main pillars of the ministry during the crisis following the news of Saratoga. Among these papers is a memorial indorsed "Smith's Thoughts on the State of the Contest with America, Febr^{y} 1778", and it seems almost certain that this was the work of Adam Smith.[1] It is printed below in its entirety. The handwriting is probably that of a copyist, and yields no conclusive evidence.

In their efforts to reconstruct an American policy after Saratoga, the English government invited suggestions from many sources. The "consequences of this most fatal event", wrote North on December 4, "may be very important and serious and will certainly require some material change of system. No time shall be lost, and no person who can give good information left unconsulted in the present moment".[2] That Adam Smith was among these persons is highly probable. In November, 1777, Lord North had appointed him commissioner of customs in Scotland, and might well claim the opinions of his distinguished nominee so soon after appointment. Adam Smith was certainly consulted on a similar problem of Irish policy in 1779, being approached through Eden and Lord Carlisle, members of the same political group as Wedderburn. Wedderburn, moreover, was a former pupil of his.

In the memorial, the author refers to himself as "a solitary philosopher", a description which, with the surname, narrows the field almost sufficiently to constitute proof. The style bears a strong resemblance to that of the known works of Adam Smith, as readers of the *Wealth of Nations* will notice. Another good basis for comparison can be found in the memorial on Irish affairs, which is printed, with other correspondence relating to it, in John Rae's *Life of Adam Smith* (pp. 350–355).

[1] I understand that Miss Edna Vosper, of the Clements Library, had already suggested that this document might be by Adam Smith, before I came to the same conclusion in examining photostat copies of the Wedderburn Papers.

[2] *The Correspondence of King George the Third*, The Hon. Sir John Fortescue, ed. (London, 1928), III. 504.

The opinions expressed are, wherever they can be tested, in perfect accord with those of Adam Smith; and there are at least two instances of specific parallels between passages of this document and those in the chapter Of Colonies in the *Wealth of Nations*. Twice in each work the author lays stress upon the ambition of the leading Americans for the preservation of their own importance in political leadership; and if the two passages in this memorial are compared with those in the known work (II. 115, 118, in the Everyman edition), a close resemblance will be seen at once. The second parallel occurs in the treatment of technical difficulties which might obstruct the representation of America in a British Parliament. In the *Wealth of Nations* (p. 120) Adam Smith explains that there would be no danger of the parliamentary doorkeeper failing to distinguish American members from unauthorized rabble, and thereby ruining the constitution as that of Rome was ruined. In the paper printed below the author deals similarly with the possibility of disputed elections, and gives much the same impression of disproportionate attention to a minor difficulty in a great problem.

In the memorial of 1778 there are two striking proposals to which attention may be called for their intrinsic interest alone, although in both there is more than a suggestion of the uncompromising and ingenious author of the *Wealth of Nations*. One is the recommendation that for a satisfactory settlement Canada should be restored to France and the Floridas to Spain, in order that the independent American states might be drawn back to friendship with England through the revival of their former enmities. The other is a proposal that the English ministry and the American leaders should agree to restore the old colonial relationship of 1763, with the understanding, not communicated to the English people, that gradually the link should be severed. The author concludes with much reason that so subtle a scheme would probably fail in the execution.

The University of California. G. H. Guttridge.

SMITH'S THOUGHTS ON THE STATE OF THE CONTEST WITH AMERICA. FEBR^{Y} 1778.

There seem to be four, and but four, possible ways in which the present unhappy war with our Colonies may be conceived to end.

First, it may be conceived to end in the complete submission of America; all the different colonies, not only acknowledging, as formerly, the supremacy of the mother country; but contributing their proper proportion towards defraying the expence of the general Government and defence of the Empire.

Secondly, it may be conceived to end in the complete emancipation of

America; not a single acre of land, from the enterance into Hudson's Straits to the mouth of the Mississipi, acknowledging the supremacy of Great Britain.

Thirdly, it may be conceived to end in the restoration, or something near to the restoration, of the old system; the colonies acknowledging the supremacy of the mother country, allowing the Crown to appoint the Governors, the Lieutenant-Governors, the secretaries and a few other officers in the greater part of them, and submitting to certain regulations of trade; but contributing little or nothing towards defraying the expence of the general Government and defence of the empire.

Fourthly and lastly, it may be conceived to end in the submission of a part, but of a part only, of America; Great Britain, after a long, expensive and ruinous war, being obliged to acknowledge the independency of the rest.

The probability of some of these events is, no doubt, very small; and it may not, perhaps, be worth while to say any thing about them. For the sake of order and distinctness, however, I shall say a few words concerning the advantages and disadvantages which might be expected from each.

I^mo^ The first event might be conceived to be brought about, either altogether by conquest, or altogether by treaty, or partly by the one, and partly by the other.

If the complete submission of America was brought about altogether by conquest, a military government would naturally be established there; and the continuance of that submission would be supposed to depend altogether upon the continuance of the force which had originally established it. But a military government is what, of all others, the Americans hate and dread the most. While they are able to keep the field they never will submit to it; and if, in spite of their utmost resistance, it should be established, they will, for more than a century to come, be at all times ready to take arms in order to overturn it. The necessary violence of such a government would render them less able, than they otherwise would be, to contribute towards the general expence of the empire. Their dislike to it would render them less willing. Whatever could be extorted from them, and probably much more than could be extorted from them, would be spent in maintaining that military force which would be requisite to command their obedience. By our dominion over a country, which submitted so unwillingly to our authority, we could gain scarce any thing but the disgrace of being supposed to oppress a people whom we have long talked of, not only as of our fellow subjects, but as of our brethren and even as of our children.

But whatever may be the impracticability of bringing about the complete submission of America in this manner, it arises altogether from the resistance of America. A plan of this kind would be agreeable to the present humour of Great Britain where, if you except a few angry speeches in Parliament, it would meet with scarce any opposition.

If the complete submission of America was brought about altogether by treaty, the most perfect equality would probably be established between the mother country and her colonies; both parts of the empire enjoying the same freedom of trade and sharing in their proper proportions both in the burden of taxation and in the benefit of representation. No expensive military force would, in this case, be necessary to maintain the allegiance of America. The principal security of every government arises always from the support of those whose dignity, authority and interest, depend upon its being supported. But the leading men of America, being either members

of the general legislature of the empire, or electors of those members, would have the same interest to support the general government of the empire which the Members of the British legislature and their electors have at present to support the particular government of Great Britain. The necessary mildness of such a government, so exactly resembling that of the mother country, would secure the continuance of the prosperity of the colonies. They would be able to contribute more largely; and, being taxed by their own representatives, they would be disposed to contribute more willingly.

That the complete submission of America, however, should be brought about by treaty only, seems not very probable at present. In their present elevation of spirits, the ulcerated minds of the Americans are not likely to consent to any union even upon terms the most advantageous to themselves. One or two campaigns, however, more successful than those we have hitherto made against them, might bring them perhaps to think more soberly upon the subject of their dispute with the mother country: And if, in this case, the Parliament and people of Great Britain appeared heartily to wish for a union of this kind, it is not, perhaps, impossible but that, partly by conquest, and partly by treaty, it might be brought about. Unfortunately, however, the plan of a constitutional union with our colonies and of an American representation seems not to be agreeable to any considerable party of men in Great Britain. The plan which, if it could be executed, would certainly tend most to the prosperity, to the splendor, and to the duration of the empire, if you except here and there a solitary philosopher like myself, seems scarce to have a single advocate. A government which has failled in accomplishing, what seemed to them to be very easy, is, perhaps, with some reason, afraid to undertake what would certainly prove very difficult. After the unavoidable difficulty, however, of reconciling the discordant views both of societies and of individuals, whose interests might be affected by this union; the greatest difficulty which I have heard of, as resulting from the nature of the thing, is that of judging concerning the controverted elections which might happen in that distant country. A Worcestershire election of which the witnesses were to be brought from America, it must be acknowledged, would prove an endless business. There should not, however, seem to be any great inconveniency, or such as could essentially alter the constitution of Parliament, in establishing particular courts of justice for deciding such controverted elections as might occur, either in that or in the other parts of the empire. The genius of the present election Committees of the house of Commons is in reality more different from that of the antient judicature of the whole house; then the genius of such courts of justice might be from that of those election Committees.

II^do^ The complete emancipation of America from all dependency upon Great Britain, would at once deliver this country from the great ordinary expence of the military establishment necessary for maintaining her authority in the colonies, and of the naval establishment necessary for defending her monopoly of their trade. It would at once deliver her likewise from the still greater extraordinary expence of defending them in time of war; whether that war was undertaken upon their account or upon our own. The two most expensive wars which Great Britain ever carried on, the Spanish war which began in 1739, and the French war which began in 1755, were undertaken, the one chiefly, the other altogether on account of the colonies. During the reign of the late king, and that of his royal father, we used to complain, that our connexion with Hanover deprived us of the

advantages of our insular situation, and involved us in the quarrels of other nations, with which we should, otherwise, have had nothing to do. But we, surely, have had much more reason to complain, upon the same account, of our connexion with America. If in those days it was the general wish of the people that Hanover might some time or other be seperated from the Crown of Great Britain; it ought to be much more their wish now that America should be so. If, with the complete emancipation of America, we should restore Canada to France and the two Floridas to Spain; we should render our own colonies the natural enemies of those two monarchies and consequently the natural allies of Great Britain. Those splendid, but unprofitable acquisitions of the late war, left our colonies no other enemies to quarrel with but their mother country. By restoring those acquisitions to their antient masters, we should certainly revive old enmities, and probably old friendships. Even without this restitution, tho' Canada, Nova Scotia, and the two Floridas were all given up to our rebellious colonies, or were all conquered by them, yet the similarity of language and manners would in most cases dispose the Americans to prefer our alliance to that of any other nation. Their antient affection for the people of this country might revive, if they were once assured that we meant to claim no dominion over them; and if in the peace which we made with them, we insisted upon nothing, but the personal safety, and the restoration to their estates and possessions, of those few unfortunate individuals who have made some feeble, but ineffectual efforts to support our authority among them. By a federal union with America we should certainly incur much less expense, and might, at the same time, gain as real advantages, as any we have hitherto derived from all the nominal dominion we have ever exercised over them.

But tho' this termination of the war might be really advantageous, it would not, in the eyes of Europe appear honourable to Great Britain; and when her empire was so much curtailled, her power and dignity would be supposed to be proportionably diminished. What is of still greater importance, it could scarce fail to discredit the Government in the eyes of our own people, who would probably impute to mal-administration what might, perhaps, be no more than the unavoidable effect of the natural and necessary course of things. A government which, in times of the most profound peace, of the highest public prosperity, when the people had scarce even the pretext of a single grievance to complain of, has not always been able to make itself respected by them; would have every thing to fear from their rage and indignation at the public disgrace and calamity, for such they would suppose it to be, of thus dismembering the empire.

III[tio] The restoration, or something near to the restoration, of the old system would sufficiently preserve, both in the eyes of foreign nations and of our own people, the credit and honour of the government. Our own people seem to desire this event so ardently, that what might be the effect of mere weakness and inability, would by them be imputed to wisdom, tho' to late wisdom, and moderation. But this event would not preserve the honour of the British Government in the eyes of the Americans. After so complete a victory, as even this event would amount to; after having, not only felt their own strength, but made us feel it, they would be ten times more ungovernable than ever; factions, mutinous and discontented subjects in time of peace; at all times, upon the slightest disobligation, disposed to rebel; and, in the case of a French or Spanish war, certainly rebelling. This event, however, does not at present seem very probable. The Americans, I imagine,

would be less unwilling to consent to such a union with Great Britain as Scotland made with England in 1707; than to the restoration, or to any thing like the restoration, of the old system. The leading men of America, we may believe, wish to continue to be the principal people in their own country. After a union with Great Britain, they might expect to continue to be so; in the same manner as the leading men of Scotland continued to be the principal people of their own country after the union with England. But after the restoration, or any thing like the restoration, of the old system, the appointment of the principal people among them, of their Governors, Lieutenant Governors, &c., will revert to the Crown of Great Britain.

The Americans, it has been said, when they compare the mildness of their old government with the violence of that which they have established in its stead, cannot fail both to remember the one with regret and to view the other with detestation. That these will be their sentiments when the war is over and when their new government, if ever that should happen, is firmly established among them, I have no doubt. But while the war lasts they will impute, and with appearance of reason too, the greater part of the oppressions which they suffer to the necessity of the times. Those oppressions will serve to animate them, not so much against their own leaders, as against the Government of the Mother country to which they will impute the causes of that necessity. It was not till some time after the conclusion of the civil war that the people of England began to regret the loss of that regal Government which they had rashly overturned, and which was happily restored to them by such a concurrence of accidental circumstances as may not, upon any similar occasion, ever happen again.

An apparent restoration of the old system, so contrived as to lead necessarily, but insensibly to the total dismemberment of America, might, perhaps, satisfy both the people of Great Britain and the leading men of America; the former mistaking, and the latter understanding the meaning of the scheme. It might, at the same time, gradually bring about an event which, in the present distressful situation of our affairs, is, perhaps, of all those which are likely to happen, the most advantageous to the State. But the policy, the secrecy, the prudence necessary for conducting a scheme of this kind, are such as, I apprehend, a British Government, from the nature and essence of our constitution, is altogether incapable of.

IV^to^ The submission or conquest of a part, but of a part only, of America, seems of all the four possible terminations of this unhappy war, by far the most probable; and unfortunately it is the termination which is likely to prove most destructive to Great Britain. The defence of that part, from the attacks of the other colonies, would require a much greater military force than all the taxes which could be raised upon it could maintain. The neighborhood of that part would keep alive the jealousy and animosity of all the other provinces, and would necessarily throw them into the alliance of the enemies of Great Britain. If all the seventeen provinces of the Netherlands had completely emancipated themselves from the dominion of Spain, their situation, as soon as their independency was acknowledged, would have rendered them the natural enemies of France and consequently the natural allies of Spain. Spain would have suffered little more than the mortification of losing the dominion of a great country, which, for some years before the revolt, had never paid the whole expence of its own government. To compensate this mortification, she would have gained the solid advantage of a

powerful, and probably a faithful alliance, against the most formidable of all her enemies. Whoever considers with attention the causes of the declension of the Spanish Monarchy, will find that it was owing, more to the recovery of the ten, than to the loss of the seven united provinces. Those ten provinces, a much richer and more fertile country than any part of America; and at that time more populous than all the thirteen united colonies taken together, never paid the tenth part of the expence of the armies which Spain was obliged to maintain in them. The neighbourhood of those armies rendered the seven united provinces, for about a hundred years together; that is, till France had conquered the greater part of the ten provinces, the constant allies of France and the constant enemies of Spain.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS

Report of the Commission on the Social Studies. Part II., *An Introduction to the History of the Social Sciences in Schools.* By HENRY JOHNSON, Professor of History, Teachers College, Columbia University. [American Historical Association, Investigation of the Social Studies in the Schools.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1932. Pp. vi, 145. $1.25.)

THIS is the second volume of the Report of the Commission on the Social Studies appointed by the Council of the American Historical Association. The commission is composed of fifteen representatives of the various fields of history, political science, civics, economics, sociology, geography, school administration, and educational research. The entire report is to consist of fifteen small volumes. Liberally financed and ably staffed, the commission is under heavy obligations, and it is gratifying to see the fruition of its work in these attractive little volumes. Taken together, they should constitute the most elaborate report thus far made of any group of studies in our educational system.

The first volume, *A Charter for the Social Sciences in the Schools,* by Dr. Charles A. Beard, appeared last year and attracted much favorable attention. The present volume, so the editor tells us, was developed from a stenotype of Dr. Johnson's lectures on the subject. It is a brilliant, if somewhat eclectic, survey of history and history teaching in the past. The conclusions will be disconcerting to the enthusiast for reform on the "educational frontier" of the social sciences—"if", asks Dr. Johnson, "apart from bringing history down to 1932 and utilizing new material aids such as motion pictures, most of our discoveries about the teaching of history . . . are only rediscoveries of ideas exploited, and some of them exploded, in the more or less remote past,—what then?" (p. 4). The "New History", for example, is not new; the "Changing World", democratized history, socialized teaching, the project method, the use of illustrations, true and false tests, the integration of the Social Sciences and other "new" devices of our time, were discussed long before we discovered them anew. According to Dr. Johnson, altogether too much zeal is spent in making twentieth century contributions to eighteenth century thought. After all, "How old the new!"

Joachim Heinrich Campe (1746–1818) was dimly conscious of the "culture epoch" theory while his contemporary, Salzmann, developed "the community approach to history" in his insistence that the pupils study the history

of their "own Schnepfenthal"! Frederick the Great wrote history and outlined school programs, advocated *Kulturgeschichte,* and claimed that history developed the reasoning faculties in that it called for discrimination between essentials and non-essentials. All the elements of a first-rate lesson in history, even the approach to the past through the needs of the present, are found in Joshua's instructions concerning the twelve stones commemorating the crossing into Canaan. The plan of teaching history backwards, that is, "from the known to the unknown", was expounded by Basedow in a dissertation published in 1752, and Priestley deliberately used history to explain their own times to English boys, a method which, laconically observes Dr. Johnson, "obviously implies an understanding of the past". Like the "Education for a Changing World", this widely acclaimed mode of approach to history is subjected to severe criticism by the author. Both are apt to lead to "much innocent distortion of facts . . . and to some deliberate falsification".

Even world history with its disregard of subjects has its prototype in Wilhelm Harnisch's program on *Weltkunde* in 1817. Following Pestalozzi, he brought together geography, mineralogy, physics, botany, zoölogy, anthropology, statistics, and history in a fusion program beginning with the study of local history, *Heimatkunde,* and adapted at each stage to the age and stature of the pupil. In the wake of this movement, there came the "concentration" theory developed by Herbart and more fully by Ziller in his treatise of 1865, in which a central, or core, subject is postulated for all instruction. Out of this came the cry of "down with school subjects"; carried to extremes by the "close concentration" advocates. According to them, a single object like an egg could serve to teach all subjects—"arithmetic in measuring and weighing the egg, geography in displaying the egg as an article of commerce, nature study in contemplating the presence of a possible chick, literature through Humpty-Dumpty and history through the egg story about Columbus". Professor Johnson adds that at the end there might be a composition by the pupil on "Eggs That I Have Eaten". During the last twenty years, general correlation has given way to a correlation in groups of studies, as, for example, general science, general mathematics, and the social studies.

As a part of an official report by a commission, this readable and interesting little volume is unique. Its clever and forceful argument, its kindly humor, accentuated here and there by biting sarcasm, should serve as a wholesome corrective to the excessive fervor of many would-be reformers in the field of our social sciences. On the other hand, there is danger that the casual reader may be misled by it into a belief that all is well with the social studies. One can live too much under the shadow of the past. Even in the social sciences, the dead hand is apt to have a cramping effect. Each generation must do its own thinking, its own planning, and, of course, its own teaching. That a knowledge of the thought and practice of the past, and, as Dr. Johnson

slyly suggests, some knowledge of the subject matter, will serve greatly to guide our planning, is sound philosophy. Any program that is worth while must be built on past experience, but it must also be adapted to present conditions. Here, as in history itself, the law of continuity, the "ceaseless process of becoming" is fundamental, and the social sciences are under constant need of being adapted to the processes of evolution and progress. Even if the "Changing World" came on the stage of human history with the expulsion of the first pair from the Garden, there is ample justification for especial emphasis upon this feature of our own times, in which accelerated change is making for a world interdependence hitherto unknown and of which our educational program, if it is to survive, must take cognizance.

Students familiar with Dr. Johnson's earlier writings will feel that by his own test the thesis of this stimulating little volume is not altogether new. They will also note the tendency to overweight the significance of ideas of individual writers of the past. In many cases these represent views which if put into practice at all had so limited an application as to have very little bearing on the needs of the mass training in the social sciences in the great national school systems of to-day. The relatively slight attention paid to the social studies other than history is out of accord with the title which suggests a broader treatment.

There is a good index, a list of the names of the members of the commission and a brief introduction by Professor Krey, the chairman of the commission.

The University of Pennsylvania. WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH.

BOOKS OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Athenian Tribal Cycles in the Hellenistic Age. By WILLIAM SCOTT FERGUSON. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1932. Pp. xiv, 197. $1.50.)

PROFESSOR FERGUSON'S latest contribution to Athenian chronological studies is at once a tribute to Dinsmoor's book, *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age* (reviewed in this journal, XXXVII. 529 ff.) and a detailed criticism of many of its conclusions. Though the book is small, it is so packed with minutiæ as to make the task of a reviewer difficult. In brief, Ferguson accepts the cycles postulated by Dinsmoor for the period between 295/4 and 263/2, and again between 145/4 and the capture of Athens by Sulla. For the intervening period Ferguson proposes alternative arrangements. One must remember, however, that Ferguson's subject is Tribal Cycles, not the archons of Athens. Thus the approval which he gives to Dinsmoor's table of cycles does not necessarily involve agreement as to the dates of specific archons.

For the first half of the second century Ferguson's dates are in general

one year later than those of Dinsmoor, but for the second half of the third century the divergence is much greater. Except for placing Thrasyphon in 221/0, there is almost no agreement between them. Within this period falls one of the most difficult and complicated chronological problems, affecting as it does nearly the whole Hellenistic world, *viz.*, in what year (Polyeuktos being archon) did Athens receive an invitation to participate in the reorganized Soteria at Delphi. Dinsmoor's answer to this question (249/8), so far as I know, has found no supporters; and since his book was published, new evidence has come to light. Ferguson's analysis of the evidence, old and new, is for the most part convincing. He favors a date immediately after the peace of 355, in agreement with the majority of scholars; yet for the benefit of those who prefer a later date, he shows how his system of cycles can be modified to suit the needs of such an hypothesis.

From this book one gains a new idea of the part played by tribal cycles in Athenian public life. We read of a new type of cycle, hitherto unsuspected, one in which offices were distributed among the tribes according to an order determined by lot, not according to the official tribal order. The results were the same in each case, for no tribe held a particular office more than once in any given cycle. Ferguson believes that such "allotted cycles" were used from time to time, and he tabulates evidence to show that this method of selection was used for the three senior archons.

Although, to quote from the epilogue, "one by one historic facts which seemed to be recalcitrant, and at times were actually such, have ceased to be obstacles, and have become instead supports", still we cannot be more optimistic than the author himself, who does "not dare to hope that the Tribal Cycles of Athens in the Hellenistic Age are now established beyond the possibility of subsequent change". He states the fundamental difficulties in these words: "Excepting Thrasyphon (221/0 B. C.) and Archon and Epicrates (147/5 B. C.), there is not a single archon in this entire interval (*i.e.*, 262–147), and consequently not a single secretary, whose precise year is incapable of being moved, and with him the secretary-cycles, by one twelve months or more—ordinarily more." May I add, with some hesitation, that the date of Thrasyphon, to which all cycles during the second half of the third century are anchored, is debatable, to say the least. The evidence for Thrasyphon comes from Magnesia, and if the Magnesian year was like that of its Ionian neighbors, as seems likely, Thrasyphon can probably be dated in 222/1. Then the cycles from 293/2 to the end of the century, and probably those at the beginning of the first century, must be modified accordingly. If we retain the traditional date for Thrasyphon, Ferguson's cycles are to be preferred to any which I have examined. Despite this lack of finality, one may be permitted to felicitate Professor Ferguson on the contributions he has made to our knowledege of the workings of tribal cycles.

The University of Cincinnati. ALLEN B. WEST.

The Legacy of Alexander: a History of the Greek World from 323 to 146 B. C. By M. CARY, M. A., D. Litt., Reader in Ancient History in the University of London. [The Dial Press History of the Greek and Roman World, volume III.] (New York: Dial Press. 1932. Pp. xvi, 448. $4.00.)

THIS volume accomplishes the feat of giving in a lucid, lively, and delightful style an intelligible account of the tangled history of the Greek-speaking world from the death of Alexander the Great in June, 323 B. C., to the time of the Roman conquests in the second half of the second century B. C. It is written as only a great scholar with a thorough mastery of all the intricate details of Hellenistic history could write it, and at the same time every page is alive with a freshness of expression and a subtle wit. There is not a trace of either careless statement or heaviness of utterance in this book.

The introduction in two pages shows clearly what the meaning and value of Hellenism is: "In a word the Greeks were called upon to play for higher stakes and the Hellenistic Age was their supreme testing time." This is followed by a vividly interesting story of the years that remained of the fourth century after the death of Alexander and the doings of the Successors down to the battle of Ipsus (301 B. C.). The third chapter follows the various streams of political and military action down to the year 275 B. C., which "may be taken as marking the end of the long period during which the fragments of Alexander's empire were being heaved and tossed in the melting-pot". In the descriptions of the men who made and unmade kingdoms at this time a single word often has an extraordinarily illuminating power: *e.g.*, in the summing up of the character and value of Demetrius the Besieger on page 52, "In the politics of the day he was merely a disturbing factor, and the Greek world could never regain its equilibrium so long as he lurched out of one adventure into the next". No better picture of this brilliant and unstable man was ever given. After the tale of the passing of Alexander's marshals and that of Demetrius, son of Antigonus, is told, Dr. Cary relates events in the separate kingdoms of Syria, Pergamum, Thrace, and Egypt, the Greek Homeland and Macedon, the doings of the Greeks of the Western Mediterranean, and the earlier contacts with Rome. After the break-up of the various Hellenistic kingdoms is described, there follow important chapters on Hellenistic warfare, and the political and administrative aspects of the Hellenistic monarchies and the Hellenistic cities. The final chapters treat of Hellenistic art, literature, philosophies, and religion. These subjects are all set forth with the same freshness and originality of interpretation that are found in the earlier historical part and one never has the impression that one is reading old stuff, even when familiar ground is gone over.

I know of no other work on Hellenistic history which gives so coherent and brilliant a picture of these centuries, the history of which as Dr. Cary

well says is "not like a fringe of different material pinned on to the fabric of earlier Greek history, but forms part of its texture".

There are several appendixes, in the first of which there is an account of the sources and authorities for the Hellenistic period; in the succeeding appendixes various moot points are discussed with the same vivid clearness that marks the whole book. Lists and *stemmata* of the various dynasties, a select bibliography, and an analytical index conclude the volume.

As a student and a teacher of the Hellenistic civilization I am profoundly grateful to Dr. Cary for this invaluable book. And it may be confidently commended to the more general reader who is interested in the course of history and of the modern world, which, as Dr. Cary says, the Hellenistic world helped to fashion in science, ethics, and religion.

Vassar College. GRACE H. MACURDY.

Claudii Ptolomaei Geographiae Codex Urbinas Graecus 82. Phototypice depictus, Consilio et Opera Curatorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae. JOSEPH FISCHER, S. J. Two volumes in four. (Leiden: E. J. Brill; Leipzig: Otto Harrasowitz. 1932. Pp. xvi, 605; [map plates, facsimiles] lxxxiii; 37, [double page] 78; viii, [map plates, facsimiles] lvii. 450 fl.)

THIS sumptuous work by a well-known cartographer and geographer forms volume XIX. of the famous series *Codices e Vaticanis selecti.* It purports to be the first complete edition of the *Geography* of Ptolemy, the last of the Greek geographers, who worked in or near Alexandria in the second century A. D., based on the most important and influential of all Greek MSS. of that work, whose value for Ptolemaic studies the editor was the first to point out.

The work is in two main sections, each of which is subdivided into a text and map volume: I., 1 is a comprehensive *Commentatio*—albeit in German—on the life, works, and influence of Ptolemy, with a historico-cartographic bibliography, list of MSS. used in the present compilation, and various indexes; I., 2 reproduces 83 maps from 53 MSS.—24 Greek, 2 Arabian, and 57 Latin; II., 1 is a facsimile reproduction of *Codex Urbinas Graecus* 82, the Greek text of Books I.-VIII. of the *Geography* with a critical apparatus in Latin, the work of the Italian Hellenist, Dr. Pio Franchi de' Cavalieri; and II., 2 is a facsimile reproduction in original size of 57 maps from the *Geography*—27 from *Codex Urbinas Graecus* 82, 27 from *Codex Vaticanus Latinus,* 5698, and 3 from *Codex Vaticanus Urbinas Graecus* 83, accompanied by introductory remarks by the editor.

This great publication, wherein the best of Ptolemaic MSS. is brought into relation to many others, both Greek and Latin, in various libraries, is the result of labors extending over a quarter of a century. To the interruption caused by the World War and its immediate aftermath we are

indebted for the inclusion of several recent publications and discoveries of source material, notably the finding by Dr. A. Deissmann, of the University of Berlin, of three important codices of the *Geography* in the Seraglio Library at Constantinople—*Cod. Constant. Seragl. gr.* 57, *lat.* 44, and *lat.* 84, the latter a printed edition of the *Geography* by Francesco Berlinghieri dedicated to Sultan Mohammed II., who reigned 1451–1481.

The most attractive part of the work to the lay reader interested in ancient geography is I., 1. In three books are discussed all questions relative to the life of Ptolemy, the man and scholar; the manuscript tradition of the *Geography* with a list of the chief Greek and Latin MSS. corresponding to the A and B redactions, based on the division into Byzantine and Asiatic made by C. Müller in his first edition of the Greek text in 1867; and the secular influence of Ptolemy's work down to the Renaissance, a millenium after his day. In Book II. is an extensive section on the history and date of *Cod. Urbinas* 82, which shows that it was brought to Urbino in the fifteenth century, probably from the great cloister of the Studium at Constantinople, and that it dates from the twelfth or beginning of the thirteenth century.

This publicaion, then, along with the first complete translation of the *Geography* into any modern language by Dr. Edward L. Stevenson, published in 1932 by the New York Public Library, reviewed here last April, has placed Ptolemaic studies upon a new basis. We are now ready for a definitive critical Greek text of the *Geography,* which will supersede the earlier imperfect attempts by F. G. Wilberg and C. K. F. Grashof (Essen, 1836–1845), C. Müller and C. T. Fischer (2nd ed., 1883 and 1901), and C. F. A. Nobbe (2nd ed., 1898–1913). The critical text of Ptolemy's work by J. L. Heiberg and others is still in progress, I., 1, 2, *Syntaxis Mathematica,* having appeared in 1898–1903, and II., *Opera Astronomica Minora,* in 1907. It is hoped that volume III. of this work may give us the long needed text of the *Geography.*

The University of Pennsylvania. WALTER WOODBURN HYDE.

Les Celtes et l'Expansion Celtique jusqu'à lÉpoque de la Tène. Par HENRI HUBERT, Directeur d'Études à l'École des Hautes Études, Conservateur Adjoint au Musée des Antiquités Nationales. [L'Évolution de l'Humanité Collective, dirigée par Henri Berr, première section, tome VI.] (Paris: La Renaissance du Livre. 1932. Pp. xxvi, 403. 40 fr.)

SINCE the beginning of the 20th century Celtic archæology has made steady and almost amazing progress. In fact, so rapidly has one discovery come after another that a few years ago the distinguished French archæologist, Camille Jullian, told the reviewer that by the time a completed article of his had passed through the different stages of printing it was almost out-of-date. And now that the Harvard University Archæological Expedition has begun

systematic excavations in Ireland, we may expect even more important revelations in the near future.

It is, therefore, obvious that the late Joseph Déchelette's *Manuel d'Archéologie Préhistorique Celtique et Gallo-Romaine* (Paris, vol. I., 1908; vol. II., 1910), excellent though it is, has become antiquated and that new evaluations and interpretations of these discoveries are now more than ever necessary. The late Professor Henri Hubert's monumental work—published after his death by three of his devoted colleagues and pupils, Marcel Mauss, professor in the Collège de France, P. Lantier, conservateur adjoint au Musée de Saint-Germain, and Jean Marx, directeur à l'École des Hautes Études—more than supplies this need, for it consists of a well-organized presentation of facts, interpreted with a broad and sound judgment, although significant details are not overlooked. This volume, indeed, makes us realize what an irreparable loss historical and archæological scholarship suffered in the premature death of this brilliant, erudite, and most versatile genius. For even if we turn to the very problematic field of linguistics, we find in the few chapters devoted to this subject a careful array of facts interpreted with a judgment that is almost uncanny when we consider how divergent—and, at times, unsatisfactory—are the conclusions of the philologists themselves.

One outstanding fact that is left in the mind of every reader as he closes the volume is that scholars in the so-called Romance field must, in the future, traverse the narrow Latin frontiers that they have built about their investigations and consider the contributions of other races to the development of the French language, history, and culture. Professor Hubert well says (pp. 19–20): "Bref, la civilisation des Celtes est au fond de la nôtre, comme la nation que commençaient à former les Celtes de Gaule est au fond de notre nation." As to their influence on French culture, we find the following significant passages (p. 20): "Le rôle historique des Celtes n'a pas été un rôle politique. . . . Mais ce fut un rôle civilisateur . . . Ce sont des professeurs gaulois, formés à l'école des druides, qui ont donné à la Gaule sa culture classique, et il y en eut du reste pour enseigner à Rome . . . Plus tard, au moyen âge, des moines irlandais rappelèrent l'Europe au culte des lettres et de la philosophie grecque et latine. Auparavant, les Celtes avaient été, pour l'Europe centrale, les intermédiaires de la civilisation grecque et n'avaient pas manqué d'y propager la leur." And finally with regard to their influence on the French language, we may note the following (p. 19): "Mais le français est du latin prononcé par des Celtes et mis au service d'esprits celtiques. Le caractère analytique de son verbe, l'emploi des démonstratifs et des particules démonstratives, l'allure de la phrase parlée lui sont communs avec les langues celtiques." Thus, the rôle of the Celts in the formation of the Central European nations is now shown to be far more pronounced than has been believed heretofore. This important aspect of linguistics Romance philologists have

neglected in seeking to adhere to the legendary belief of the French that their language and culture go back solely to Greek and Latin sources.

And so M. Hubert makes a complete survey of prehistoric Celtic civilization up to the epoch marked by the archæological remains found at Tène on the southern shore of Lake Neufchâtel in Switzerland. In the first part of his work entitled "Ce que sont les Celtes", he analyzes "Le nom et la race", "La langue", and "Les données archéologiques". In the second part, dealing with "Mouvements des populations celtiques", he discusses "Les origines des Celtes", "L'expansion des Celtes dans les Iles Britanniques", "L'expansion des Celtes sur le continent à l'âge du bronze—Goidels et Bretons", "L'expansion des Celtes sur le continent à l'époque de Hallstatt", including their spread in the Hispanic peninsula. At the end of the volume are to be found an excellent bibliography, an index of names, as well as lists of maps and archæological objects reproduced in the text. There are various errors, to be sure—usually of a typographical character—scattered throughout the volume and the paper on which it is printed is, unfortunately, abominable, but these shortcomings—for which the author, of course, is not responsible—should not in any way detract from the value of this really remarkable work. After a careful perusal of it, one is enabled to estimate at its true worth A. Grenier's more recent *Manual d'Archéologie Gallo-Romaine* (Paris, 1932).

Columbia University. JOHN L. GERIG.

The Administration of Normandy under Saint Louis. By JOSEPH REESE STRAYER, Princeton University. [Monographs of the Mediaeval Academy of America, no. 6.] (Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy of America. 1932. Pp. 133. $3.25.)

THE quality of Dr. Strayer's studies was shown four years ago by his chapter on "Knight Service" which appeared in the *Haskins Anniversary Essays*. That chapter reappears now as part of a description of Norman institutions under the Capetian kings prior to Philip IV. With scientific caution the author has confined himself very strictly to Norman evidence, giving careful account of whatever may be observed in Norman documents but avoiding any attempt "to bridge over deficiences" in his sources by citing apparently analogous institutional developments described in recent studies relating to other provinces. The future scholar wishing to study the thirteenth century French monarchy can turn to this work confident that he will find a detailed picture, drawn from the local sources, of secular administration in Normandy.

The present work provides a valuable supplement to the earlier studies of Borrelli de Serres, Delisle, Haskins, Powicke, and Packard, upon whose researches Dr. Strayer leans, and whose conclusions he illustrates, corroborates, or corrects from his own investigations of the manuscript materials

to be found in the Paris and Norman archives. The picture which he presents is not one of dramatic or decisive constitutional developments but is concerned rather with administrative trends and tendencies the study of which requires patient and thorough investigation of a large number of documents, and the presentation of which precludes startling or brilliant generalizations. We are shown the introduction of the French *baillis* and the consolidation of the Norman *bailliages*. The slow process by which appellate jurisdiction to the exchequer and to the parlement of Paris was developing is indicated. At the same time it is made clear that Norman institutions were permitted to continue along their own line without any systematic effort from Paris to weaken Norman jurisdiction. This did not prevent that persistent encroachment by the *baillis* on all feudal, communal, and ecclesiastical jurisdictions, which was the process whereby royal authority waxed strong. Most interesting is the discussion of the financial administration. Under St. Louis this was still dealing with a revenue almost entirely feudal, but the transition from a service to a money basis was nearly completed. The author asserts that the most probable influence exerted by Norman institutions upon those of the French monarchy is to be found in the efficient mechanism of financial administration.

While there is an interesting chapter on The Royal Administration and the Towns the author himself admits that there is still much to be learned about the relations of the communes to the crown. He makes clear that the thirteenth century sources support Packard's theory that the communes were not created in order to increase military resources. He pictures the commune as a dying institution in process of being subordinated to the royal authority. For the theory that the crown deliberately protected towns and fostered commerce he says there is no evidence. "Almost complete peace and relatively honest government" provided all that a medieval community needed to insure prosperity. Study of the personnel of the royal civil service leads to the conclusion that the chief officials acted according to "a high standard of honesty, as honesty was then measured" and that their subordinates were "no worse than a modern police force".

Williams College. RICHARD A. NEWHALL.

Le Droit Coutumier de Cambrai. Par E. M. MEIJERS et A. S. DE BLÉCOURT, Professeurs à la Faculté de Droit de l'Université de Leiden. [Institut Historique de Droit, Leiden, série II., 4.] (Haarlem, Willink and Sons. 1932. Pp. 250. 12.75 fl.)

WHILE preparing his *Le Droit Ligurien de Succession aux Pays-Bas,* Professor E. M. Meijers of the law faculty at the University of Leiden was much impressed by the number and the value of the unpublished sources for the customary law possessed by the various towns in the Tournai-Cambrai region. Having abandoned the idea of printing relevant excerpts from this

material in an appendix, partly because of the excessive quantity and partly because it seemed essential that these documents should be printed, if at all, *in extenso,* he now publishes the present volume, with the aid of a colleague and some twenty students, as the first of a series of editions of the sources for the customary law of this district.

The Cambrai material, as here printed, is based upon seven manuscripts mainly from the municipal archives at Douai and Cambrai (although the most interesting one, the *Livre bleu,* is privately owned at Douai) and upon various original documents from the departmental archives at Lille and the municipal archives at Cambrai. The collection comprises the well-known *Lex Godefridi* of 1227 (Latin text and contemporary French translation, both superior in accuracy to previous editions, are carefully printed in parallel columns), an early thirteenth century collection of inquests, an unofficial compilation of the thirteenth century called *Les coutumes des francs hommes,* various collections of cases, notes, and judgments arising from the customary law and compiled by individual practitioners (ranging in date from the late fourteenth to the sixteenth century), unofficial chronological lists of judgments and decisions made by the *chambre de la paix* of Cambrai in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, a selection of charters and ordinances of Cambrai (1258–1508), and a miscellaneous group which includes official oaths of the thirteenth century and an ordinance for the judicial duel of the same period. A second volume, nearly ready for the press, will print judgments and inquests from the official registers and from the *Livre bleu* and will present a general survey of the customary law of Cambrai in the form of a systematic table.

The editors have searched the archives thoroughly for their material, have edited their documents with great care and skill, and have added very considerably to the printed sources for the study of the customary law of the region concerned. They point out rightly the great value of these documents for the comparative study of medieval institutions since they belong to the customary law of the Low Countries yet are closely related to that of northern France. The editors have necessarily limited themselves to the subject in hand, rigorously excluding even the most valuable material concerning the municipal organization of Cambrai and similar topics.

In addition to the introduction, which describes the material printed and the manuscripts used, there is an alphabetical table of *coutumiers* and a chronological table of judgments and decisions. The book, with its wide margins, clear type, excellent paper, and attractive binding, is a beautiful example of the printer's art.

Smith College. SIDNEY R. PACKARD.

BOOKS OF MODERN HISTORY

The Evolution of the French People. By CHARLES SEIGNOBOS, Professor of Modern History, University of Paris. Translated from the French by CATHERINE ALISON PHILLIPS. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1932. Pp. xv, 382, xii. $4.25.)

WHEN one of the leading historical scholars of France, and for that matter of Europe, publishes at the age of seventy-eight, after three years of labor, a history of the *Evolution of the French People* in one small volume of 382 pages, he does a great service to his fellow countrymen and to all who are interested in France.

This book is not a mere summary of events. It is sprinkled with expressions of opinion which sometimes accord with the ordinary opinion and sometimes not. For instance, he writes that financial embarrassments provoked the crises which gave birth to the Revolution: Neither anger at abuses nor desire for Liberty and Equality was enough to change the system. The government and the privileged classes still had power to prevent reform. It was the need of money which provoked the conflict.

The Revolution gave every region of France its own elected administration completely independent of the central power, as in the United States, and conferred on it police and even tax collecting power. The government now appointed only ministers, diplomatists, and army officers.

His judgment of Napoleon is familiar, but lucidly put: "Napoleon never succeeded in feeling himself a Frenchman. His last farewell to her [France] in his will uses an expression no Frenchman would have dreamt of using. He knew the clan of his native Corsica. He was ignorant of the power of national sentiment either in France or elsewhere." Less familiar is the judgment on Louis XIV. A foreign envoy wrote that the Court of Versailles was not suited to the genius of the nation. "It was never gay. Louis XIV may have appeared as the incarnation of the greatness of France but he never represented the French character."

It is to be regretted that the writer has "relegated literature, the arts, and science to a secondary position". Surely it is a little strange to read a history of France whatever the title and not find in it the name of Pasteur.

M. Seignobos points out that up to the sixteenth century the records give us a knowledge of the facts "incredibly incomplete and fragmentary and historians have presented legends or conjectures or rash generalizations. It is this inaccurate and biased history that obtained a foothold among the cultured public alike in France and abroad." For example he says: "We know hardly anything about the towns in the greater part of France."

Perhaps the most valuable characterization is made just before the close of the book:

From the middle of the 17th Century on, the essential features of the average Frenchman's character are plainly apparent—in spite of very great

individual diversities—a peasant, artisan and bourgeois type of character, prudent, distrustful and economical, greatly inclined to vanity, very sociable though not very hospitable, endowed with a swift, clear and precise intelligence, prone to mockery rather than to enthusiasm, ready of speech and fond of talking, skilled in psychological observation, more circumspect and calculating than its easy flow to words and frequent gestures would lead foreigners to suppose, inured by long tradition to a regular life, greatly attached to its everyday habits and better suited to individual work than to collective enterprises.

The work has now appeared in a French edition, entitled *Histoire Sincère de la Nation Française: Essai d'une Évolution du Peuple Français* (Paris, Rieder, 1933, pp. xii, 510, 16 fr. 50).

Princeton University. PAUL VAN DYKE.

Christopher Columbus: Documents and Proofs of his Genoese Origin. Published by the City of Genoa. English-German Edition. (Bergamo: Istituto Italiano d'Arti Grafiche. 1932. Pp. 288.)

To the general reader the question as to where Christopher Columbus was born is not of great interest or importance. To the city of Genoa, credited by historians with being his birthplace, and claiming and proclaiming that distinction in an imposing monument of stone, it is a major question. The distinction has been contested on behalf of other places, and the authorities of Genoa have consequently come to its defense. A commission of fourteen members, under the presidency of the mayor, has produced a volume of which the work before us is a version in French and German. The two languages are in parallel columns on the same page, which makes the reading more convenient than in the Italian edition, where the lines run the width of the expansive page. The weight of the volume, nine and one-half pounds, and the lack of continuity and arrangement of the text, are serious defects. An excellent feature is the correspondence of the pagination of the translation to that of the original—a great convenience in the use of the two works.

The translations are anonymous. They are well done, but not flawless. The author of the English was apparently not quite up to his task. A master of the language would hardly have started off with such a blunder as *rivendication* (p. v) or have written: "the existence of which had already been *signalled* by Navarrete" (p. 238) . . . "Prof. Altolaguire *notified* it to the Academy" (p. 239) . . . "original native country" (p. 90). The translation was the more difficult for the use made, without definition, of such ambiguous terms as *Genova* (town or province), *appartenenza* (residence, citizenship, or birth), *Italianità* (same), *cittadino* (born or naturalized). *Atti dimonstranti l'appartenenza a Genova* is rendered *Deeds proving . . . Genoese origin* [birth]. There is no deed that proves origin. The author does not pretend that there is. He proves the origin to himself, if not to others, without positive evidence, by a sophistical *tour de force*. ". . . His

place of birth", he says, "is revealed by Christopher himself, who when living in Savona . . . describes himself in a legal deed as a wool worker of Genoa . . . by this last declaration, made in a Ligurian city other than Genoa, it is evident that Columbus wished to indicate that part of Liguria in which he was born" (p. 138). How awkward for Christopher, if in Genoa he had declared himself, as he might truthfully have done, a wool worker of Savona, thus proving himself born in both places. The author's handling of this crucial question is hard to reconcile with the implication of the title and the professions in the preface and introduction, that the work was to prove its thesis by unimpeachable documents.

The facsimiles are well executed, but a number of them, shorn of head and tail, do not attest their date or authenticity. These are generally furnished by the author. The pertinent passages are reproduced in print, as transcribed and as translated. A few, that are not printed, are illegible except to trained paleographers.

The work as a whole is ill adapted both to reading and to consultation. It has no index or running titles. Its table of contents is slender. It has no designated chapters. Neither lines nor paragraphs are numbered for reference. It seems designed to defy orientation and thus oblige a reader to go through it.

The preface is written by the mayor, the introduction by a member of the commission, Dr. G. Pessagno, and the body of the work by another member, Professor G. Monleone, with the assistance of Dr. Pessagno.

The body of the work is devoted to making out a case by circumstancial evidence, based on facsimiles of printed matter and manuscripts. The only positive evidence adduced is the discoverer's alleged will of 1498, containing the phrases: 'I being born in [the city of] Genoa' and 'from it I came, and in it I was born'. The original of this document is lost. There is evidence that it was repudiated by the testator. This point is not touched on by the author. The text which he presents in manuscript is an unauthenticated, unsigned, extract copy, apparently of a draft or project made in 1497. He represents this manuscript as procured from Spain by the ambassador of the Republic of Genoa at Madrid in 1586. He quotes passages from the letter of instruction, but not these opening words: "Columbus of Cogoleto is very great in Spain, as you know". The ambassador is to get a copy of the will reported to have been made by the great Columbus [of Cogoleto] and to lend his support to Genoese pretenders to the Veragua succession [as descendants of this Columbus]. He presents in print a facsimile of part of the will or draft, as published about 1607 in the report of the lawsuit over the Veragua succession, and refers to the publications of Navarrete (*Coleccion de los Viages* . . . ed. 1859), but does not produce or cite a single complete authenticated copy of the will, or for the secondary sources, any indication of their authority or foundation. Was the text in the lawsuit contested? Was it

accepted by the court as valid? Was it accepted as probative; if so, of what? Where did Navarrete get his text? What, if anything, does he say about his source? Such questions are left to the reader's guess or speculation.

This incomplete compilation and disjointed, chauvinistic discussion is not without value as a contribution to systematic, impartial investigation. May it serve to awaken and quicken interest in the subject, and bring about a commission representing the scholarships of Italy and Spain, and equaling or exceeding their joint delegation, the scholarship of the rest of the world.

Washington, D. C. JOHN BIGELOW.

Gesammelte Studien zur Geistesgeschichte der Renaissance. Von ERNST WALSER. Mit einer Einführung von WERNER KAEGI. [Schriften herausgegeben durch die Stiftung von Schnyder von Wartensee verwaltet von der Zentralbibliothek Zürich.] (Basel: Benno Schwabe. 1932. Pp. lx, 359. 20 fr.)

IN recent years it has been made abundantly clear that the intellectual movement commonly called the Renaissance was not a revival of a dead or neglected civilization, but that throughout the Middle Ages classical literatures were studied with care and appreciation. Comparatively few historians, however, have been aware of the fact that, contrary to the views of J. Burckhardt, J. A. Symonds, and Ph. Monnier, the majority of the Humanists were not irreligious, nor semi-pagan, nor hostile to the clergy.

It is most refreshing to follow the career of Professor Ernst Walser of Basel, who labored diligently for a period of thirty years to familiarize himself with the thoughts of the more important Italian and French Humanists. The results of his labors have been set forth in an admirable biography of Poggio, in numerous articles and reviews, and in a series of published lectures. Professor Walser was eminently equipped for his task, partly because he was a Swiss and therefore readily mastered the German, French, and Italian languages. His sojourns in Italy and France enabled him to note details which had been overlooked by other scholars.

A very readable account of Walser's life and an excellent analysis of his views have been presented by Dr. Werner Kaegi. His introduction will prove a useful guide to the articles and lectures which he and Mrs. Walser selected for publication in the volume now under discussion.

The two most important compositions in this volume are those dealing with the essence of the Italian Renaissance. Illuminating also are the six lectures given in the University of Cambridge on "Human and Artistic Problems in the Italian Renaissance". Finally, the selections devoted respectively to Boccaccio, Salutati, and the Renaissance in France show clearly how profound was Walser's understanding of Italian and French Humanism.

Walser disposes very ably of the misleading classification of religious

leaders and scholars under the heads of Humanists, mystics, and scholastics. He proves with distinct facility that many a Humanist used the scholastic method, that other Humanists were mystics or favorably disposed toward ascetics, and that not a few were monks themselves or friends of monks. He has taken pains to shed much needed light on the religious views of such notorious characters as Poggio and Valla, and he skillfully analyzes the characters of Lorenzo de' Medici and Machiavelli. He corrects the fallacy propounded and repeated by leading authorities according to which the Renaissance ushered in a radically altered conception of God, the world, and man (see especially pp. 97–102).

But there is one difficult problem which Professor Walser does not seem to have solved. He entertains a definition of Christianity which differs considerably from that of such thinkers as Pastor and Monnier. In asserting that Poggio throughout his life, both inwardly anad outwardly, acted as "ein papsttreuer Christ und ein begeisterter Jünger der Antike" he obviously regards Poggio as a good Christian. This was his privilege, but he apparently did not take cognizance of a similar privilege assumed by Pastor. He deserves credit for having depicted Lorenzo Valla in a more sympathetic manner than was possible for other writers, but he seems to have ignored the distinction between Humanists who wrote obscene literature part of the time and those who seldom read and never produced a single page of such literature. Consequently, Pastor was moved to write to Walser in the following words: "Uebrigens Pomponius Laetus war doch sicher kein Christ mehr." He might have said the same about Poggio or Valla.

The University of Michigan. A. Hyma.

Deutschland vor der Reformation: eine Zeitenwende. Von Willy Andreas. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt. 1932. Pp. 644. 14 M.)

This book presents a synthesis of the history of German civilization in the half century before the Reformation. Its first section holds a remarkably drawn picture of the unity of the medieval world-scene and its disintegration, with full display of the ecclesiastical and religious life of the late Middle Ages. A central section of four chapters reveals the critical developments of political and social life in Empire and territorial states, the economic and cultural life of the cities in this their golden age, the hard problems and struggles of rural existence. The final chapters grapple with problems more subtle and intricate, for they undertake to analyze and assay the intellectual and artistic life of Germany in a period of transition and ferment.

Founded throughout on the multitudinous monographs and special studies which in the course of at least a generation have explored almost every detail of this vast historical panorama, Andreas has attempted a composite and interpretative history, which shall serve not only to satisfy the

appearances in the judgment of the scientific specialist but also "to portray the period of transition on the threshold of the Reformation as seen and understood by a German of to-day who, in the midst of a changing world and national collapse, has never abandoned the belief that destruction can also carry with it the promise of new life".

Unmistakably, the melancholy, the crude, the seamy, the horrible, are evident in fifteenth century life; authors who devote books to it, Huizinga, Stadelmann, and others, mislead only if they claim the whole is identical with a part. And the unlovely as well as the beautiful catch the eye in the very heart of Andreas's book, in his admirable chapters on the life and culture of the German cities. The data are full, the judgment enlightened. Here is no indulgence in dawdling melancholy, nor overwrought civic panegyrics such as those of Conrad Celtis on Nuremberg in which Andreas marks the evidence of unhealthy and declining culture. Yet in how much were crisis and woe, as Andreas shows, the manifestations of a new order of things struggling to birth! Profoundly essential to realize that this Germany, in deep commotion, moved "im Zwielicht von Mittelalter und Renaissance".

With all the author's interest in the macrocosm, it is on the microcosm that he must focus sharply in this early age of individualism. Whether concerned with Paracelsus or Erasmus, with Trithemius, Dürer, or Jacob Fugger, his characterizations are distinctive and discriminating. To appreciate their quality the reader may compare Andreas's finely etched portrait of the Emperor Maximilian with the too flattering monotone in the pages of Johannes Janssen's first volume.

It is profoundly gratifying that Andreas has proved equal to an undertaking of formidable dimensions and baffling complexity. He rises everywhere superior to the mere trader in historical facts. Nowhere in contemporary historiography, to my knowledge, is there a comparable presentation of German Humanism and the Renaissance. The detail of their description, the criticism of their manifestations, the exposition of the Italian differences and the Italian debt, reveal a historian of learning, acumen, philosophic power, and controlled judgment. Upon these matters the work is a stanch and healthy corrective of the superficial and summary views, explicit and implicit, in the pages of so many books in the English language, pretending often, with their cheap clichés, to rid historical society of an arch-cliché, the Renaissance!

Duke University. ERNEST W. NELSON.

Francesco Guicciardini, Diario del Viaggio in Spagna. A Cura di CONTE PAOLO GUICCIARDINI. (Florence: Le Monnier. 1932. Pp. 123. 70 l.)

IN 1512, the young Francesco Guicciardini was sent to Spain by the Florentine Republic, as a "good will" ambassador, charged with the delicate

and responsible task of winning the allegiance of Ferdinand of Aragon, but in such a way that neither France nor the papacy should be antagonized by the alliance. In his various reports and private letters, collected in the *Opere Inedite,* Francesco has reported at length the success of this mission. The account of his journey from Florence to Logroño, a short distance from Burgos, where Ferdinand was holding court, has been only recently discovered, and while it has no especial political importance, it is of more than passing interest for the information it gives of the cities through which Francesco passed, and the general conditions, political and social, which confronted the traveler of the *Cinquecento.*

The manuscript was discovered during the cataloguing of those sections of the famous Guicciardini Archives, recently opened to the scholarly public by their owner, the Conte Paolo Guicciardini, one of the most eminent of modern Italian historians. It is a small paper book in the author's own handwriting, but apparently not intended for publication, since it quite lacks the tormenting corrections, correction of corrections, additions and correction of additions which characterize most of the existing manuscripts belonging to Francesco. He seems to have written merely to satisfy his innate need for recording his own experiences, much as he jotted down the notes forming the *Ricordanze,* likewise a recent discovery, published by the same scholarly editor.

This mission marks the beginning of Francesco's diplomatic career. He was then still under thirty, and quite aware of the honor his appointment conferred on one of his years. Florence had up to that time been able to maintain a fair degree of neutrality, but she was learning how poor a defense neutrality is when one's neighbors are all at war. Soderini was not willing to declare himself as favoring either France or the papacy, nor was he willing to commit the government to a definite proposal to Ferdinand. Consequently Guicciardini's instructions were vague and difficult. He seems to have acted according to his own judgment in whatever decisions were to be made. For the journey, he was told to follow the Riviera, passing through Genoa and Marseilles. Instead, he went to Lucca, struck northward to Piacenza, then through the Po Valley to the Alps, then angled southwestward, passing through Carpentras, Avignon, Nîmes, Narbonne, Perpignan, Barcelona, and then westward, through Lerida and Saragossa and along the Ebro to Logroño where the *Diario* ends. Judging from the entries, he chose this way as being the more adventurous. He dwells at length upon the difficulties of wind and weather, of brigands and custom duties, and he was as keen to search out the historical monuments as any modern tourist. Of his mission, he says nothing; he does not even mention his companions. The journey lasted fifty-two days, during which time they covered over a thousand miles; "a happy voyage" he calls it. One can understand the omission of any reference to the purpose of the embassy. The chief charm of the *Diario* lies in the brief and

pungent comments concerning what he saw—people, market places, chapels, and agricultural conditions.

The document is admirably edited, with adequate notes and with reproductions of contemporary maps showing the line of march taken by Francesco and his companions from Florence to Logroño. As one of a projected series based on the rare collection of papers, public and private, belonging to the Bardi, the Albizzi, the Venturi, as well as the Guicciardini families, all now a part of the Guicciardini Archives, the little volume is of more than passing interest.

Boston. GERTRUDE R. B. RICHARDS.

A Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe. By CARLTON J. H. HAYES. Volume I., *Three Centuries of Predominantly Agricultural Society, 1500–1830.* (New York: Macmillan Company. 1932. Pp. xix, 863. $3.50.)

THIS work when completed will be much more than a revision of the author's *Political and Social History of Modern Europe,* issued in 1916. Volume I. is virtually a new book. Not only is it a third longer than its predecessor but by far the greater part has been rewritten, reinterpreted, and reordered. With the introduction of carefully selected contemporaneous illustrations and maps, the appearance of the book has also been improved. The sketch maps, however, are unsatisfactory; they are either too small in scale, poorly projected, or actually inadequate to the text. The dynastic charts, on the other hand, are admirably constructed and carefully interlarded. The chapter bibliographies have been brought up to date and have been assembled conveniently in the appendix.

Professor Hayes has been among the first in recognizing the importance of factors other than political in the treatment of general history. That this conviction has gained ground is amply demonstrated in the new volume. Deeming the term *social* too narrow in scope, he has adopted the term *cultural,* with a broader anthropological connotation, to designate his interest in the whole range of the non-political activities of mankind. Without relaxing interest in political, social, and economic phenomena, Professor Hayes has deliberately expanded those portions of the work dealing with intellectual development. The account of the sixteenth century intellectual awakening has been amplified and the rise of nineteenth century romanticism is treated at some length. A large chapter entitled The Intellectual Revolution has supplanted the meager pages devoted to the intellectual activities of the eighteenth century. The student, though burdened with the task of identifying innumerable *objets d'art* and the phrases of natural science, should gain in appreciation of the richness of his social heritage.

The new volume is characterized by a greater wealth of fact and evidence which in turn has enhanced the value of both the skeletal organization and

the interpretative sections. Thus Part III., formerly entitled Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, now, Revolutionary Developments of the Modern World, includes a treatment of the British revolutions and the intellectual revolution, as well as of the French Revolution and its aftermath. In passing it may be remarked that Volume I. concludes with The Era of Metternich, formerly the introductory chapter of the second volume. The style employed is as vigorous as ever but facts and conclusions are no longer hammered out in one, two, three manner. Thus the three cardinal effects of the Commercial Revolution have given way to an enlightening essay upon the rise of modern capitalism and the five significant results of the Protestant revolution to a well integrated discussion upon the status of Christianity after the religious upheaval. The author, however immersed in his task, never forsakes the present, and his observations upon nationalism, toleration, and subjects of kindred importance will challenge the understanding of the discriminating student. All that is new, however, represents not so much the increase of historical knowledge during the past fifteen years as the maturing of a scholar.

Princeton University. J. E. Pomfret.

English Public Finance, 1558–1641. By Frederick C. Dietz, Professor of History in the University of Illinois. [The American Historical Association.] (New York: Century Company. 1932. Pp. xviii, 478. $4.00.)

This volume, a culmination of preliminary studies, surveys the entire field of English governmental receipts and expenditures from the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the opening of the Long Parliament. It is a work of great labor and considerable importance; and it deals with a subject so slightly investigated that the praise due a pioneer must be accorded to its author.

More than half of the book is devoted to a historical survey of the government's fiscal problem throughout the period in question, and the methods employed in meeting the needs of the national exchequer. Correctly beginning with the administrative reforms of Lord Treasurer Winchester and the surprisingly large military expenses before 1570, Professor Dietz passes on to the quieter period of prudential frugality between 1572 and 1585, in which Burghley actually acquired a small surplus. In the last years of Elizabeth, however, military expenses turned the exchequer into a bottomless pit from which the early Stuarts were unable to extricate themselves, due chiefly to the prodigality of James, the foolish war policy of Charles, the rise of prices, and the quarrel with Parliament. The desperate shifts of early Stuart lord treasurers clearly illustrate the changes that had taken place. A second portion of the book contains studies of the financial productivity of crown lands, customs duties, and parliamentary grants and something (but none too much) of the administration in collecting and handling these

revenues. There are also special chapters on expenditures in selected military and civil departments.

Professor Dietz has given us the first comprehenhive study of a very large subject during a period in which to an unusual extent governmental policy must be interpreted in the light of the financial situation. He has also made possible enlightening comparisons of the relative importance of individual items of revenue and disbursement. Recusancy fines, for example, are shown to be of small significance and the preponderating drain of military over all other expenses is given the emphasis it deserves. The book contains a mass of information about all sorts of methods for raising revenue, ephemeral as well as fundamental. The chapters on the customs are especially interesting.

Several criticisms may be made of this work. There is a surprising number of minor errors, some of them in transcription from the manuscripts from which the figures are drawn. The reviewer has tested five lists of figures taken at random and has found such errors in three. Although these errors are all minor, they impart an uneasy suspicion that there may be many more. The author also occasionally seems to ignore the general spirit and broader currents of the time with which he deals. The rising opposition of the Commons against the crown, for example, is ascribed almost entirely to their miserly and tight-fisted reluctance to part with their money. There is perhaps a tendency to accept statements in manuscript material without sufficient question. Sometimes also a looseness of phraseology obscures the author's meaning.

The University of Minnesota. DAVID HARRIS WILLSON.

The Development of Religious Toleration in England from the Beginning of the English Reformation to the Death of Queen Elizabeth. By W. K. JORDAN, Ph. D., Instructor in History and Tutor in the Division of History, Government, and Economics in Harvard University. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1932. Pp. 490. $5.00.)

"PHILOSOPHICAL toleration . . . rests upon the power of truth to overcome error" and "presumes a mind which has definite and pronounced religious opinions, but which is able and willing to concede to other minds the right to retain and practice contrary beliefs". This ideal conception of Creighton and Brooks, Jordan holds before him. In Elizabethan England, however, he finds only a "legal toleration" which "signifies simply a refraining from persecution" and "presumes an authority which has been and which again may become coercive". The laws of Elizabeth reveal little even of this latter brand, but the practice of Elizabeth found expedient a winking at laws which made England moderately comfortable for the religiously unorthodox. Besides, a painstaking analysis of Elizabethan theory discovers in all groups writers whom expediency drove to promulgate pleas for toleration. Acontius,

indeed, produced in 1565 a philosophical justification of toleration which Jordan believes was not equalled until Locke's day, if then.

Prior to Elizabeth the state persecuted religious beliefs as such because it felt responsible for a pure faith; Elizabeth persecuted for political reasons. Elizabeth had no desire to punish opinion, but public order demanded outward conformity. Her interests were secular; her aims were peace and loyalty to the crown; her ideal was an Erastian establishment comprehensive enough to embrace diverse groups; her method was enactment of severe laws for use in emergencies, coupled with leniency through nonenforcement so long as political loyalty was preserved. Her executions were in theory, at least, for treason, not heresy. Political exigencies, papal interference, or Puritan zeal forced her at times to rigorous measures. But during her first and last decades, she was lenient indeed—though she retained the right to persecute. Jordan discovers a public opinion which necessitated repeated disclaimers of interference with belief, even when she did, in the troubled middle years, punish religious offenders for "treason".

Jordan describes the factors which nourished toleration. He analyzes in detail the theory of each religious group. He finds each unwilling to relinquish in the abstract its right to impose the true belief on others by force, but each promulgating new arguments for toleration in order to meet practical needs of the moment. The government contributed the practice of limited toleration; Anglicanism, the importance of reason in religion, and freedom for *belief* as opposed to worship; Puritanism, the right of private judgment; Brownism, the idea that only spiritual persuasion could win converts and a declaration that persecution was anti-Christian; lay thought, the theory of relativism, the separation of spiritual and civil power, the ideal of reconciliation through agreement upon great fundamentals, and a denial of the possibility of absolute truth; English Catholicism, the argument that religious conformity was not essential to civil loyalty, even that religious liberty must be the basis for a united state.

A fuller treatment of the economic and social factors underlying toleration would have been valuable. The book deals too exclusively with political theory and governmental policies. One feels that after all, though he left few records, that inscrutable ordinary mortal who was neither cleric, counselor, nor theorist must have influenced the development of toleration. To have shown this would have tied theory to reality. A concluding chapter is needed to gather together, compare, and evaluate the contributions of the various groups considered.

The book contributes richly to intellectual history. Its style is good, the presentation thorough, the bibliography impressive. Contemporary quotations and author's narrative are skillfully interwoven to produce vividness and clarity without verbosity. Throughout 420 pages of theory the author sustains keen interest. He covers an almost new field. Seaton dealt similarly

with the next century but is summary by comparison. Klein's work was less exhaustive and gave much time to political facts which Jordan wisely assumed. Read had treated government policy admirably. But Jordan has done pioneer work in tracing the development of an important idea through its little known beginnings. His analysis of contributing forces is brilliant. He discovers a surprising liberality in practice. He brings to light unguessed theoretical support of toleration. He makes it clear that toleration grew out of practical necessities of warring groups who disliked it but found it necessary to their living together.

Washington, D. C. HOWARD K. BEALE.

The Cabinet Council of England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, 1622–1784. By EDWARD RAYMOND TURNER, Ph. D., Late Professor of European History in The Johns Hopkins University. Edited by GAUDENCE MEGARO, Ph. D., with an Introduction by E. R. ADAIR, M. A., McGill University. Volume II. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1932. Pp. xix, 480. $7.50.)

AT the time of his premature death, December 31, 1929, Edward Raymond Turner had already published three volumes of his exhaustive study of the privy council and the cabinet with particular reference to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The fourth volume was left "complete in typescript". After it had been sent to the printer and had reached the stage of page proof, Dr. Gaudence Megaro, one of his former students, was asked "to go over it as thoroughly as possible and to add a bibliography and an index". In pursuance of this difficult and delicate task Dr. Megaro states: "I have restricted myself to making only the modifications and changes which I feel sure Mr. Turner would have made had he seen the volume through the press." He gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Mr. J. A. McKnight, jr., a graduate student at The Johns Hopkins University, who went over the galley sheets; and, thanks to their united efforts, there seem to be practically no typographical errors. An appendix contains a list of two pages of slips in the volume previous to this: whether drawn up by the author or the editor is not stated. There are thirty-seven pages of bibliography which, although Dr. Megaro says that it "makes no pretense to completeness", is, nevertheless, extremely full, at least in source material, since the chief secondary works are enumerated in the introduction. In referring to William Blathwayt (p. 430) the various positions which he held might have been enumerated. The fact that the chief collections of public and family papers are not merely enumerated but described adds to the value of the bibliography. While the index is detailed enough so far as page references are concerned, it is not the type that the reviewer finds most helpful; but the text is so crowded with names and allusions that an analytical index might have run into scores of pages.

Professor Adair's introduction on the work of the late Dr. Turner, with particular reference to the privy council and the cabinet, and to the contributions of other investigators in the field is excellent. Owing to his own researches he is well qualified to speak; moreover, his appraisal is marked both by discrimination and sympathetic understanding. Mindful of the difficulties confronting a student of one of the most elusive institutions in English constitutional history, Professor Adair undertakes, among other things, to answer two general criticisms that have been directed against Turner's work. The first has to do with his treatment of the council in the sixteenth century—the link between the period where Professor Baldwin's indispensable *King's Council* terminates and his own real researches begin. In bridging over this gap he professedly depended much on the findings of others and sought to base conclusions on evidence far less ample than he was to accumulate for the two subsequent centuries. The explanation advanced is that Turner discovered after he started that such a preliminary survey was necessary and that any other method would have delayed unduly his main work. The second criticism is of precisely the opposite character—the presentation of a superfluity of material in describing the growth of the council from the time of the Stuarts and the emergence of the cabinet from the parent institution. As Professor Adair points out this was an evidence of Turner's conscientious thoroughness, his irresistible conviction that he must offer every scrap of evidence that would bear in any way upon the vast and baffling problem to which he devoted the greater part of his all too short life.

Perhaps the most significant contribution of this posthumous volume, the second on the cabinet, is the candid and painstaking discussion as to whether there was, during the middle years of the eighteenth century previous to 1783, a double cabinet, an inner and an outer, as Professor Temperley has aimed to show, or whether the former was really an indefinable group of the more active and influential members with no fixity of personnel or status. While the problem is puzzling, a rather convincing case is presented for the latter conclusion.

Thanks to Edward Raymond Turner's persistent industry we have a monumental collection of evidence which not only throws much light on the growth and functions of a most important institution but will help to illuminate studies in related fields of English constitutional history.

The University of Michigan. ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

The French Revolution. By CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN, Professor of History in Columbia University. Two volumes. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1932. Pp. vii, 1078. $7.50.)

PROFESSOR HAZEN'S two volumes have the virtues one expects from his pen. They tell the story of the French Revolution neatly, briskly, and above all, clearly. The work is not a textbook. The banishment of footnotes to the

back of each volume, the condensed but critical bibliography, the simplicity and liveliness of the style, the willingness of the author to explain everything to a possibly ignorant or confused reader (in marked contrast to the allusiveness and obscurity of the much-read Madelin)—all these are qualities which should help win over the general reader, as they are certainly qualities which make the book more useful didactically than many a professed textbook. The proportions of the book are excellent. The thousand pages give room enough for color, for direct quotations, for pregnant details; yet they will not frighten the modern reader, as might the many-volumed sets of Michelet, Taine, or Jaurès. It is perhaps not unfair to say that Professor Hazen has done, with the benefit of a hundred years of historical writing, a job comparable in many ways to that done first by Mignet. Both books are clear, readable, unembittered narratives, written by men in the great tradition of the Revolution itself, heirs, not of the frenzy of that Revolution, but of its calmer moods, of its aspirations and its myths.

No doubt careful search of these volumes would unearth certain errors of fact, inaccuracies—such as the all but universal one of including the Tarn-et-Garonne on a map of Revolutionary France—but such errors would be neither numerous nor important. Professor Hazen is too conscientious a scholar, his reading has been too long and too varied, to make any such critical approach to his book profitable. Discussion is possible, not as to facts, but as to the use made of facts. Now Professor Hazen uses his facts as a good nineteenth century Continental liberal would use them. Naturally enough a royalist, a Tory, a relatively disinterested and logical person, or even, perhaps, a twentieth century liberal, must consider such use to be abuse, distortion of the facts. Of Professor Hazen's picture of the Old Régime criticism can hardly be as tentative as the preceding. Frankly, the Old Régime as seen in this book no longer exists save in the minds of a few French politicians and in the pages of a great many French schoolbooks. The men of the great French Revolution built up a myth about the Old Régime in order to justify themselves. This is a common political process, and may be compared with our own popular myths about George III., North, the Hessians. But while American historians have for some time been aware of the mythical element in their own revolution, and have been able to discount it partially, French historians have not until quite recently shown any signs of criticizing these stereotyped notions. Even Taine, loathing the Revolution, accepted, and indeed added to, the Revolutionary myth of the Old Régime. The late Albert Mathiez began to abandon the official position here as elsewhere, and there are signs that, with men like M. Gaston Martin, even French professional historians of the left are willing to revise their views of the Old Régime. As evidence of Professor Hazen's preservation of the older stereotypes, we can here cite but two examples. He repeats (p. 78) the hoary instance of the peasant giving up four-fifths of his income to king, lord, and

priest, and supporting himself and family with the rest. He gives the impression that Voltaire was martyred, that in general the censorship of the Old Régime was cruel and not ineffective (p. 79). Now the peasant mulcted of four-fifths of his income may have existed as an isolated exception, but he is not the statistical generalization he pretends to be. The basis for such statistics certainly does not exist in print, and probably does not exist in the archives. As for Voltaire's "exile" in Ferney, one can only point out that it was a bit too profitable to have been wholly involuntary. The censorship of books fell chiefly upon obscure theological works; when it did strike a book meant for the general public, it merely helped the sale of that book.

Professor Hazen's treatment of the Revolution itself is much less affected by his misunderstanding of the Old Régime than one might expect. But historians need no longer feel that failure to grasp "causes" will invalidate "effects". Indeed, the fact that Professor Hazen sees the Old Régime with the eyes of the Revolutionists makes him a sympathetic narrator, if not a profound critic, of what they did. One chapter alone (ch. XXXVI., Economic Aspects of the Terror) calls for comment. It will seem to some that Professor Hazen has here been led astray by too close an adherence to M. Marion, and that he has completely misunderstood the work of Mathiez. Now the subject is, as Professor Hazen says "complex and difficult". But it is not simplified by making paper money a sort of personal and therefore unreal villain. M. Marion almost literally sees the assignats as an embodiment of the devil himself, a poetic procedure in a way, and perhaps natural to the *rentier* temperament, but certainly not a method to be recommended to the economist. Since we historians are bound to go to the economic theorist in these matters, we ought to go to the best available—in this case to Mr. S. E. Harris, whose book, *The Assignats,* is based on a sound training in modern monetary theory. Professor Hazen's wholesale condemnation of the *maximum* would seem to deny that it was successful even as a method of rationing. Yet he cites (p. 734) oats, which, at first free from price-fixing, rose so high that people fed their horses wheat at fixed prices. This condemnation of the *maximum* is certainly a strange conclusion to draw from the work of Mathiez; and Mathiez and M. Marion, even as sources, make a strange pair.

Harvard University. CRANE BRINTON.

Metternich and the British Government from 1809 to 1813. By C. S. B. BUCKLAND. (London: Macmillan and Company. 1932. Pp. xxii, 534. 25*s.*)

Metternich. By ARTHUR HERMAN. (New York: Century Company. 1932. Pp. 370. $5.00.)

MR. BUCKLAND, whose kindly ministrations at the Public Record Office in London have endeared him to many scholars, has taken as his theme the tortuous course of relations between Britain and Austria in the years from

1809 to 1813. Not only has the author thoroughly studied the rich manuscript resources of the Public Record Office and the British Museum, he has also made judicious use of the more important printed works, primary and secondary, which impinge in any wise on his subject. The product of his thoughtful and diligent research is a welcome and valuable addition to the literature dealing with the tangled diplomacy of the late Napoleonic age.

Inasmuch as the Peace of 1809 prohibited normal diplomatic intercourse between Austria and Britain, communication had to be carried on unofficially and clandestinely. Only the ingenuity of the diplomatists limited the character of the contacts. Both powers maintained secret missions which informed their respective governments, as well as they might under the rigors of the Napoleonic spy system, of the views of the other. The author has an unfortunate faculty for introducing personalities into his narrative without any explanatory data so that the reader is left at sea; eventually, however, they are characterized in swiftly and skillfully drawn vignettes. Of the British intermediaries in Vienna, the Hanoverian, Count Hardenberg, a "shrewd searcher of hearts", enjoyed most fully the confidence of the astute Metternich and sent to London the most authoritative and reliable reports. King, whom the British foreign office dispatched to Austria in December, 1810, though it was August before he reached his destination, established formal diplomatic relationships in an informal fashion. Never in Metternich's confidence, King forfeited what little favor he had earned by his connivance in insurrectionary plans, of which the Austrian statesman learned by a most detestable stratagem. Honest, but impetuous and clumsy, King served Downing Street well until his recall at Metternich's behest in March, 1813. Apart from these principal advisers, there must have been a full dozen other secret agents and roving diplomats who endeavored to keep London posted on the sinuous course of Austrian diplomacy. Woefully little did they relate concerning the parlous financial conditions of the Hapsburg state and the friction prevailing between Vienna and the stiff-necked Hungarians. What immense technical difficulties existed in the transmission of intelligence Mr. Bückland has clearly explained. Sometimes communications were months on the way so that the governments were but inadequately acquainted with the facts upon which they based their diplomatic policies.

Metternich pursued toward Bonaparte a "creeping and crawling" strategy, yielding to the French ruler when advisable, but, apparently, keeping foremost in mind an ultimate union with Britain in order to accomplish the "Good Cause". Great Britain was justly suspicious of the sincerity and the reliability of the Austrian foreign minister. Did not Metternich, during his long sojourn in Paris in 1810, broach to Napoleon a plan, drafted by his aide Gentz, for negotiating peace between Britain and its implacable adversary? Above all, did he not, despite his fervent assurances to the British agents to the contrary, enter into active alliance with France in March, 1812? The

explanation given Hardenberg that this alliance was necessary in order to save Austria from French spoliation was unconvincing to the British foreign office. Metternich, on his part, had reason for irritation because British emissaries encouraged, even though moderately, the patriotic insurrectionary ferment in the Tyrol and Adriatic lands. Scarcely less annoying was the appearance in November, 1812, of Lord Walpole in Vienna. Sent from St. Petersburg by Cathcart, British envoy there, without the specific sanction of London, Walpole sought to persuade Metternich to divorce himself from France, make peace with Russia, and prepare for active participation in the "Good Cause". Metternich, who regarded the mission as a thinly-disguised Russian enterprise, spurned the overture and obliged Walpole to quit the country. On several occasions the Austrian foreign minister voiced to Hardenberg and in London directly his desire to serve as an "honest broker" between France and Britain. Not until just a month before Austria renewed the warfare against Napoleon did Britain evince any willingness for mediation. Promises of British subsidies were influential in leading Austria to share in the "Good Cause".

On all these topics, Mr. Buckland has shed much fresh light, illuminating them by copious excerpts from the dispatches. One regrets that an occasional sentence or paragraph was not introduced to show the nexus between the events narrated and the broader European scene. It is regrettable, too, that the book lacks an index.

Mr. Herman has composed the best, full-length biography of the greatest of Austrian diplomats available in the English language. He appears to have leaned heavily upon Professor Heinrich von Srbik's exhaustive and authoritative *Metternich, der Staatsmann und der Mensch* (Munich, 2 vols., 1925), though he makes no reference to his obligation other than mentioning the work in his unannotated bibliography.

For two full generations Prince Metternich controlled Austrian foreign policies, and the excellent survey of those policies forms the distinguishing feature of the biography. More attention might legitimately have been awarded the decisive years 1809 to 1814. And part of the space devoted to the prince's romance with the charming Princess de Lieven—almost exactly as much as that devoted to the Congress of Vienna—might advantageously have been bestowed on Metternich's policy with respect of the Prussian *Zollverein*. The rôle of Metternich in internal politics is capably dealt with for the period 1835 to 1848, but there is little for the years before 1835. Like Bismarck later, Metternich after his forced retirement from official political life did not hesitate to express disapproval of the conduct of Austrian diplomacy. He opposed not only the ungracious and neutral attitude toward Russia during the Crimean War, but also the conduct of relations with Sardinia which precipitated the war of 1859. In the interesting concluding section, "Retrospect", Mr. Herman discloses the wide variety of the prince's

interests, and summarizes succinctly the opinions on the man reached by historians and publicists. In common with Von Srbik, the author interprets Metternich's career in a much more favorable light than has traditionally been the case.

The University of Rochester. ARTHUR MAY.

Italy in the Making, 1815 to 1846. By G. F.-H. BERKELEY. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1932. Pp. xi, 292. $3.25.)

MR. BERKELEY has set himself the task of giving us a new account in English of the critical period of the Italian national movement. The present volume is introductory. The turning point, the great test of temper and methods, came, he believes, between 1846 and 1849, and in another volume Mr. Berkeley expects to present the crisis.

The author comes to his task prepared by thirty years of consideration, long periods of residence in Italy, much consultation not only with books but with men, and an obvious enthusiasm for the exposition of his theme. He focusses the reader's attention sharply on five main forces, which he designates as "the Conservative Reaction", "the Revolution", which he finds incarnate in Mazzini, "Piedmont", "the Papal State", "the Moderate Movement". He states the position of Austria in the peninsula, and presents the portrait of Metternich as retouched by Professor Srbik; he defines once more the ideals of Mazzini; gives much attention to Charles Albert as well as the Piedmontese reformers, Gioberti, Balbo, and D'Azeglio; and goes into detail in depicting the political organization of the Papal States, the popes Gregory XVI. and Pius IX., and the peculiar issues that they had to face. But the real subject of the book, Mr. Berkeley insists, is the Moderate Movement, and this he presents by giving us a close analysis of the works of Gioberti, Balbo, Durando, and *Gli Ultimi Casi di Romagna* of Massimo D'Azeglio.

It is difficult to decide for whom Mr. Berkeley's volume is written. He has adopted a highly schematic method of treatment, which has resulted in the banishment from his pages of the great world of eaters and drinkers and doers, the "big buzzing booming confusion" of reality, without which history grows "pale and spectre-thin". Whether this simplification is for the benefit of the general reader, to enable him to find a way through an exceedingly complicated story, or is designed to adapt the book to the needs of undergraduates, is not manifest. In either case what we are given is a "movement", of ideas and policies, but not Italy developing into a nation.

It is a bold stroke of simplification to exclude from a history of "Italy in the Making" all of its parts but Piedmont and the Papal States. It can be defended only on the thesis that Italy was made by policy and a few great books. Mr. Berkeley has indeed attempted nothing more than a political and intellectual sketch of the period 1815–1846. But in fact the policies and the

literature which he describes were important chiefly as an attempt to construct a new framework for a civilization that was undergoing a change. Under the influence of a great revolution in European society and of an active propaganda in Italy, journalistic and literary, an influential part of the nation in all of its divisions was assuming new habits and new points of view and eagerly cultivating in Italian soil institutions appropriate to "the century". Mr. Berkeley has overlooked all this, and also the works of Prato and Professor Ciasca, who have established the need for a corresponding reconstruction of the whole history of the moderate national movement.

If Mr. Berkeley had seen this broader perspective, he would not have failed to distinguish between the two wings of the moderate liberals, the Neo-Guelf wing on one side and the secular liberals on the other. Their divergence turned not merely, as Mr. Berkeley seems to think, on their respective loyalties to the papacy and Piedmont, but no less on the contrasting ideals of the Liberal Catholic movement and the industrial-scientific movement of the century. This distinction is a background necessary to any discussion of Gioberti, Balbo, and D'Azeglio. But Mr. Berkeley has not only left a growing Italy out of his picture, but, if one excepts diplomacy, Europe as well.

It is clear that Mr. Berkeley has lived with his sources, and he delights in telling his story and has a keen sense of its dramatic turns. But his volume will be a disappointment to historians. Not only has he oversimplified his difficult undertaking, but he has used too little new material, overlooked too much of the best work in print, used opinion too uncritically as the basis of broad generalizations, and remained too much an amateur, though in the best sense of that term, to fulfill the hopeful promise of his enterprise. But if used critically, his book will serve a good purpose for students without a knowledge of Italian who need a sharp definition of the tangled political issues and clear summaries of the most important literary documents of the period which his volume covers.

The Johns Hopkins University. KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD.

Lamartine et le Peuple. Par ETHEL HARRIS, Docteur de l'Université de Paris. (Paris: J. Gamber. 1932. Pp. ix, 549. 35 fr.)

ALPHONSE DE LAMARTINE has always presented to historians a perplexing problem. From his début in politics during the latter part of the Restoration to his retirement from public life, he was regarded as an enigma. And the general consensus of historical opinion has been that he was only a *force passagère* in the social history of France. Poet-statesman that he was, he was often ridiculed by his contemporaries, and to later generations he has appeared more in the light of a romantic idealist whom fortune placed for a moment in power, but whose influence was soon eclipsed by the more practical policies of Orleanist, Bonapartist, and Socialist. This interpretation,

however, is not the one proposed by Miss Harris in her detailed study *Lamartine et le Peuple*.

Miss Harris admires the poet-statesman for his undeniably lofty idealism. Possibly, however, she makes too high an estimate of his personal influence during the last ten years of the July Monarchy. Lamartine's *discours* were magnificent orations but they caused amusement to a number of his more hard-headed and less human contemporaries. His influence in France was great, but it is doubtful if he was ever taken very seriously by many of his fellow gladiators in the chamber of deputies. The reviewer cannot agree with the estimate of his personal influence that is made by the author of this book. There is, however, another aspect of this study of Lamartine that is of very real importance.

In the course of four hundred odd pages, Miss Harris traces the development of the *pensée politique* of Lamartine. This part of the work is exhaustively and excellently done, and the sum total is that the author has portrayed in lucid fashion not only the evolution of Lamartine's social philosophy, but also a very interesting and suggestive social study of Lamartine's own times. In following the story of his friendships and his journeys the reader is introduced into the society of the *petite noblesse* and of the peasant in Burgundy, he sees the growth of humanitarian sentiment and social work in the provinces, and, once the young poet has established himself in Paris, the reader witnesses the interplay and clash of the utopian schemes of Lamennais, Louis Blanc, Arago, and others. Among them all, the thought of Lamartine is the only one that is free from the idea of social struggle and that insists on social amelioration through reconciliation of the various classes of French society. Coöperation, peace, and fellowship were the bases for that type of humanitarian reform that was advocated so eloquently by "le solitaire de la Chambre". Idealistic as they were, their growth was retarded by the more sinister political forces represented by Cavaignac, Molé, Thiers, and the adherents of Louis Napoleon.

There was, however, a more practical phase to the thought of the poet-statesman. It is frequently ignored, and one is grateful to Miss Harris for her treatment of it. Lamartine dealt not only in fiery speeches and poetic rhapsodies, he also wrote social and economic pamphlets. In this work he was associated with such honored names as those of Tocqueville, Beaumont, and Courcelles. He wrote and discoursed on prison reform, railway expansion, and slave trade. In these fields of study the poet showed himself to be far in advance of some of the best minds of his time. It is, then, rather as Prophet of the People than as leader that Lamartine finds his real importance. A romanticist, he could not escape from flights of fancy that were often too high for his colleagues to understand, but the fact remains that today many of the social doctrines that he uttered are truisms.

Yale University. JOHN M. S. ALLISON.

Ireland and Irish Emigration to the New World from 1815 to the Famine. By WILLIAM FORBES ADAMS, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of History in the University of California at Los Angeles. [Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany, XXIII.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1932. Pp. vii, 444. $4.00.)

THE migration of a people is an unusually difficult subject to investigate, unless treated in a very restricted way. The material is of necessity scattered, whilst social and economic conditions in at least two widely diverse countries must be mastered. If the migration is not planned and regulated by some government, but is spontaneous, the problems confronting the investigator are multiplied. This book, which in an earlier from was a Yale doctoral dissertation, overcomes most of the difficulties, and fills very adequately a gap in the general history of migration.

Among the motives for emigrating from Ireland in the period, Professor Adams assigns first place to "distress". He analyzes the social and economic Ireland of 1815, emphasizing the effects of over-population and a notoriously bad land system. The absentee landowner gets off with a light sentence, and the government also. Here, as so often, an attempt to show why a given population in the nineteenth century increased so fast, is not entirely convincing. The emigrant trade is studied, and the relation shown between cargo carrying and the conveyance of emigrants, particularly in the timber trade. After 1830 the stream of emigration swelled, and the author estimates that between that year and 1840 about 650,000 people left Ireland—some two-thirds going to North America and the rest to Great Britain. In this period for the first time, more than a half of the emigrants are Roman Catholics.

The policy of the British government is dealt with very fully. The author shows that planned and assisted emigration usually had its champions, and these their definite schemes. It was the *laissez-faire* doctrine, however, together with considerations of economy and the government's frequent preoccupation with other matters, that won the day. The opinion is advanced that independent emigration achieved the desired result, and that conditions on board the emigrant ships, ameliorated as they were by the Passenger Acts, were reasonably good except in years of famine.

The concluding chapter shows the Irish immigrant in his new home, what he achieved there, and what in turn was wrought upon him—and the picture is a very interesting one. Here the author confines himself almost entirely to the United States, and when he does turn to the immigrants in Canada his touch becomes less sure. The judgment passed on the Irish immigrants and their descendants is that, considering their initial handicaps, they have succeeded as well as have the men of other races.

An appendix contains a valuable critical estimate of that very unsatisfactory type of source material, the statistics of early nineteenth century

migration from Ireland. Two colored maps, showing where the principal seed-beds of Irish emigration were situated, add to the usefulness as well as to the appearance of the book. The voluminous materials on which this work is based, have been used critically and adroitly. The subject contains so much that is or has been controversial, that it particularly requires the impartial treatment which it here receives.

Yale University. GILBERT TUCKER.

An Economic History of Modern Britain. By J. H. CLAPHAM, Litt. D., F. B. A., Professor of Economic History and Fellow of King's College. Volume II., *Free Trade and Steel, 1850–1886.* (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1932. Pp. xiii, 554. $5.50.)

THE second volume of Clapham's great economic history of Great Britain makes an even more significant contribution to knowledge than the first, since it explores a field which is comparatively unknown to even serious students of the nineteenth century. Here is history in the grand manner. On the vast sweep of the canvas there is developed nothing less than the story of the mid-Victorian prosperity and the transformation to a modern industrial state of a society in which agriculture had only just yielded to manufacture.

Biographies and autobiographies, files of the *Economist,* trade journals, hunting novels, monographs, census reports, and other official papers, all sorts of materials, in fact, except the records of industrial and commercial companies, probably much less available now than for an earlier period, have been ransacked for information about detail and general tendencies. There is much less reliance than in the first volume of the book on the reports of parliamentary commissions, simply because in the days of their prosperity the Victorians had fallen out of the habit of investigating themselves. They returned to it only during the depression of the seventies. The volume is a synthesis of all that has been written on the economic history of the period.

The burden of the work is the story of the rise of Great Britain's industrial supremacy under the ægis of free trade through her leadership in the production of steel. The main thesis is accompanied by an encyclopedic mass of information and succinct and excellent discussions of topics covering every phase of the economic history of the time. The chapter on the Course of Industrial Change gives virtually all that is essential about the new processes and technological developments in iron and steel production, shipbuilding and shipping, engineering, the textile trades, the food industries, the clothing trades, mining, gas and the chemical industries, and electricity. Other chapters cover in equally complete fashion the Development of Industrial Organization; Communications, including the history of railways and railway policy, canals, cabs and omnibuses, turnpike trusts, and the telegraph; Over-

seas Trade and Commercial Policy; Agriculture, with a study of the agricultural depression of the seventies; the Organization of Commerce, with attention to the grain trade, the coal trade, the London food trades, the cooperative movement, speculation, arrivals and futures, the stock exchange, and insurance; the Economic Activities of the State, with a detailed account of public expenditure, taxation, the national debt, the abandonment and imposition of restrictions upon free enterprise, such as the usury and shipping laws, and the factory acts, health legislation, and the new poor law; and the Face of the Country in 1886–1887, a description of housing in town, suburbs, and country, of woodlands and forest, crops, fields, and fences, the geography of industry, and the coasts and the pageant of sea power. The sections on Money, Prices, Banking, and Investment, and those on Life and Labour in Industrial Britain, which take up the growth of population, the hours of labor, rates of wages, the cost of living, the burden of taxation, friendly societies, and radicalism and socialism, are the best treatments of these difficult matters to be found. The text is accompanied by nine elaborate maps and diagrams, showing the railways and canals, exports of iron and steel, wages, prices, and discount rates for the period, and occupations according to the census of 1851.

Through the entire book there is real objectivity. With no thesis to advance or cause to prove, Clapham has buried the economist in the historian. Occasionally, there is a suggestion of pride in the British achievement, or a tendency to correct some of the gloomier pictures of the sociologists of the eighties and nineties, who were engaged in preparing the emotional basis for the acceptance of social reform. There is in the volume no discussion of economic imperialism, certainly under way by 1886. Perhaps this is reserved for the third volume, which it is to be hoped will appear very soon.

The University of Illinois. F. C. Dietz.

The Schleswig-Holstein Question. By Lawrence D. Steefel, Assistant Professor of History in the University of Minnesota. [Harvard Historical Studies, volume XXXII.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1932. Pp. xii, 400. $4.00.)

This notable contribution to American historical scholarship does not cover in a detailed fashion the whole Schleswig-Holstein question. The author leaves the earlier history of the problem to "antiquarians, legists, and specialists in local history". In an introduction of fifty-three pages he then summarizes the history of the question from the rise of nationalism among and Danes and Germans early in the nineteenth century to the issuance of the March Patent. The main portion of the work, nearly two hundred pages, is devoted to an exposition of the interplay of the complex diplomatic and military events of the period between March 30, 1863, and October 30, 1864, the date of the signing of the Treaty of Vienna, the agreement by which Denmark surrendered its claims to the three duchies of Schleswig, Holstein,

and Lauenburg. A final chapter sketches the main outlines of the later phases of the problem. Ten appendixes give important excerpts (many of them published for the first time) from the diplomatic documents. A selected critical bibliography of sixteen pages gives an excellent introduction to the manuscript and printed sources. The index gives adequate aid in making the contents accessible. Three maps throw additional light on the subject.

The Schleswig-Holstein question has evolved very slowly from the status of news of the day to scientific history. From the time the situation became tense documents and interpretations intended to justify the policies of the different governments began to make their appearance. Contemporaneously or soon afterward considerable documentary material was published in the *Archives Diplomatiques*, a series of British *Blue Books*, the *Staatsarchiv*, and the *British and Foreign State Papers*. In 1890 Heinrich von Sybels's third volume of his *Begründung des Deutschen Reiches durch Wilhelm I.* came out. Based on the still unavailable Prussian archives it at once became the classic account of the whole question. In 1897 appeared Karl Jansen's *Schleswig-Holsteins Befreiung*, and the first volume of Heinrich Friedjung's *Der Kampf um die Vorherrschaft in Deutschland*, which gave the Augustenburg and the Austrian points of view. In 1910 the publication of the first volumes of *Les Origines Diplomatiques de la Guerre de 1870–1871* threw new light on French policy. This was supplemented somewhat by Hermann Oncken's *Die Rheinpolitik Kaiser Napoleons III. von 1863 bis 1870 und der Ursprung des Krieges von 1870/71*. For the most part American scholars have hitherto neglected the valuable work of Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian historical investigators.

The book under review supplements and supersedes much of this earlier work. Its author has studied with praiseworthy objectivity the papers bearing on the subject to be found in the archives of London, Copenhagen, Paris, Vienna, and Berlin, has diligently explored the work of the Scandinavian scholars, and has carefully read and digested the older literature on the Schleswig-Holstein question. From these materials he has constructed a narrative, characterized by a Gallic clarity of organization and exposition, which throws much new light on the whole subject. He gives particular emphasis to the comparatively little known Scandinavian movement that goes so far toward explaining the obstinate stubbornness of Denmark during the crisis.

The author, however, might possibly have added to the value of his contribution in a number of ways. As the reviewer laid down the work he felt that some of the pertinent facts in the early history of the problem (such as Erich Brandenburg gives in his *Reichsgründung*)—an explanation of the *Nationalverein*, a fuller and clearer account of the military events, and more correlation between the diplomatic moves and political and economic conditions might profitably have been given. There is no indication in the text of

the narrative, for example, that the declarations of the diplomatic documents concerning the state of public opinion have been checked by a survey of the leading journals or parliamentary debates. In this respect, however, the author merely follows well-established traditions of diplomatic studies.

The University of Wisconsin. C. P. Higby.

Life of Sir Michael Hicks Beach (Earl St. Aldwyn). By Lady Victoria Hicks Beach. Two volumes. (London: Macmillan and Company; New York: Macmillan Company. 1932. Pp. xi, 351; vii, 414. $12.00.)

Sir Michael Hicks Beach was one of Lord Salisbury's most trusted lieutenants, and he held high offices in the governments of Disraeli and Salisbury—Irish secretary, colonial secretary, president of the board of trade, leader of the House of Commons, and chancellor of the exchequer. But he was not, during his lifetime, placed in the front rank among Victorian statesmen. Nor are the reasons therefor hard to find. Stern, reserved, and competent, "Black Michael" scorned to use the popular arts of politicians; both in Parliament and on the hustings, he was outshone by contemporaries belonging to his own side of the house, notably Lord Randolph Churchill, Arthur Balfour, and Joseph Chamberlain; and many of his virtues were looked upon as old-fashioned in the period of "the Victorian Sunset". Indeed, he was far from being happy in his position as chancellor of the exchequer, 1895–1902. Hicks Beach belonged to the Pitt-Peel-Gladstone school of financiers. Stoutly he resisted raids upon the treasury for new social services, swelling of armaments, and risky colonial and foreign ventures. He watched uneasily the policies pursued by Rhodes and Chamberlain in South Africa, scrutinized the expenditures in Egypt, the Soudan, and China, deplored the growing demands from the war office and the admiralty, and lamented that the reduction of the national debt, carried on steadily for more than a generation, ended with the outbreak of the Boer War. Realizing that he was out of step with his colleagues, he seized upon the retirement of Lord Salisbury in 1902 as a golden opportunity for relief from burdensome duties. In retirement Sir Michael, or Lord St. Aldwyn as he became in 1906, joined the Conservative "free-fooders" and tried vainly to check the conversion of his party to protection and imperial preferences.

Hicks Beach was in many respects a typical conservative of the Victorian era. He loved hunting, farming, the soil and those who live close to it, and the Church. Efforts to disestablish the Church were classed practically in the same category as attempts to grant home rule to Ireland—they were anathema to him. But withal, he was fair-minded and enlightened. The exploiting Irish landlords of the type of Lord Clanricarde were as objectionable to Sir Michael as were Parnell and his friends; coal miners of Wales engaged his services as arbiter in wage disputes; he regretted the Lords' opposition to the budget of 1909; and he urged Liberal chancellors of the

exchequer, 1914–1916, to adopt as far as possible a pay-as-you-go policy. Though the thought might have shocked him, Hicks Beach was on many points a Gladstonian.

Lady Victoria has done the work as biographer of her father extremely well. She is candid and critical. That Hicks Beach was brusque, at times easily aroused to anger, and somewhat of a martinet, she admits. But naturally, the more than compensating virtues are stressed. She has searched painstakingly through both private papers and official records, and some of the letters and memoranda printed in full or in part add much to our knowledge of the period 1874–1916. The volumes are of special value for students of the Conservative attitude towards and treatment of Ireland, the South African situation, 1878–1880, financial issues and imperial policies, 1895–1902, party and cabinet problems, and the financial situation, 1914–1916. But also on other topics connected with the social, economic, and political history of the period covered will this biography be found useful. Extracts from letters written and a journal kept during a visit to the United States and Canada, 1870, contain items of interest. The rising statesman was favorably impressed with our schools; but of President Grant he wrote, "I never saw a meaner looking man".

The University of Wisconsin. PAUL KNAPLUND.

The Life of Joseph Chamberlain. By J. L. GARVIN. Volume I., 1836–1885. (London: Macmillan and Company; New York: Macmillan Company. 1932. Pp. xiv, 624. $5.00.)

THIS is the first volume of the much-heralded biography of Joseph Chamberlain upon which the distinguished editor of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and of the *Observer* has been working for ten years. Mr. Garvin is noted for vigor and piquancy of style and in this book he is at his best. By training and temperament he is just the one to appreciate at his full worth a man like Joseph Chamberlain. Following English tradition, he gives much attention to Chamberlain's ancestry and boyhood days—in this instance a difficult task which in hands less skillful would make dull reading. We then follow Chamberlain's life through his business years, his career as mayor of Birmingham, his entry into Parliament, his inclusion in Gladstone's second cabinet, and his political activities to the election of 1885.

The Chamberlains were Dissenters rather than Nonconformists. As Unitarians they belonged to the "dissidence of dissent", and were considered "more heretical than Jews". But "if they believed in only one God they payed twenty shillings to the pound" and were a highly respected and hard-working family. The lucky purchase of an American patent for making screws sent them up in the world, and Joseph Chamberlain amassed a comfortable though not fabulous fortune. While still on the sunny side of forty he was able to retire from active business to devote himself to politics.

His first interest therein came from his religious training. As a young man he was accustomed to arise at six to teach Sunday School before breakfast, and he was stirred to the depths by what seemed to him the betrayal of the Nonconformists by Gladstone's education bill of 1870. Chamberlain opposed this measure, ran for Parliament, was defeated. In 1873 he became mayor of Birmingham. "In twelve months, by God's grace, the town shall not know itself." This was Chamberlain's pledge, and it was fulfilled. The city was speedily "parked, paved, assized, marketed, gas-and-watered, and improved". All this was done by an uncompromising radical who stood on his own special platform of "free land, free schools, free churches, free labour".

The Birmingham mayor became a national figure. He was made much of by John Morley. He wrote violently in the *Fortnightly* demanding that Liberalism swing to the left and cease identifying itself with the Whigs. He adapted the methods of the American caucus to British party government, built up a local political machine, and in 1876 became an M. P. Within four years the radical trouble-maker was a member of Gladstone's second cabinet. It was a "forced entry". Gladstone did not want him, neither did the queen; but if the Liberal party was to hang together representation had to be given to the left, and it was either Dilke or Chamberlain.

During the troubled years of Gladstone's second ministry Chamberlain grew in power. The Grand Old Man had great difficulty in curbing what *Punch* called the "daring duckling". Chamberlain had radical ideas in regard to everything; he objected to coercion in Ireland; he insisted on local Irish self-government; and he demanded land reform not only in that island but in England. "What ransom will property pay for the security it enjoys?" This question of his seemed rather socialistic to the queen and to Mr. Gladstone.

Chamberlain was pressing the prime minister hard. Gladstone two decades before had thus acted toward Lord Palmerston; now rôles were reversed. The young man from Birmingham threatened to revolt. Gladstone, as Palmerston had done in his case, tried to keep him in order. The parallel was a deadly one; youth would be served. Power had lain with Palmerston; but with the passing of the years Gladstone had forced him to the wall. Now he in turn was on the defensive before this upstart who talked glibly of an "unauthorized program" and of "ransom".

And so ends Volume I. If we may judge from the span of years covered the complete biography will be in at least three volumes. If the last two retain those literary qualities which characterize the first, the excitement and the ozone of it, this will be none too long. The reviewer can find no fault whatever with this book, except a curious reference to the University of Virginia as the University of Charlottesville (p. 33).

Princeton University. WALTER PHELPS HALL.

Documents Diplomatiques Français, 1871–1914. Série I (1871–1900), tome IV., *13 Mai, 1881–20 Février, 1883.* [Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, Commission de Publication des Documents relatifs aux Origines de la Guerre de 1914.] (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale. 1932. Pp. xxxvii, 614. 60 fr.)

It is significant of France's inactive Continental policy during this period that only five of these 614 documents are reports from St. Petersburg. Due to the supposed irreconcilable differences between Slav and German, the union of the three emperors was regarded as temporary (nos. 39, 58), but there was no doubt that Russia had accepted Germany's lead. Saint-Vallier, in Berlin, was filled with despair by the evidence of Italy's *rapprochement* with Germany and Austria (no. 116). He warned Paris that Bismarck's friendly support, which was continued during this period in questions relating to Tunis (nos. 2, 16, 306), was at the mercy of another Cherbourg speech, of an anti-German demonstration, and in general that the ministry's optimism was not justified by the international situation (no. 62).

Of the numerous colonial questions illustrated in this volume, the Egyptian crisis is by far the most important. It accounts for a majority of these documents, although a third were printed, usually with minor textual changes and omissions, in the *Livres Jaunes.* Fear of a possible Pan-Islamic movement in North Africa stands out more clearly than before as a chief cause of France's opposition to the proposed Turkish intervention in Egypt. The new material is most valuable, however, for the light it throws upon the triangular relations between France, England, and Germany. Saint-Vallier feared that the growing anti-French feeling in England would make France too dependent upon Germany's good will (no. 69). Bismarck did not, in fact, see eye to eye with France in Egypt; he once told Courcel that the best solution of the question would be the purchase of the nationalist leaders like Arabi Bey (no. 392). He was said to have suspected the Gambetta ministry of intending to use the affair as an occasion for a diplomatic offensive (no. 244), but he explained his continued reserve under the more moderate Freycinet as caused by concern for Germany's relations with Turkey (no. 392). Courcel thought that Bismarck intended to establish German influence at Constantinople (nos. 269, 309), to supplant France in Egypt, and to divide France and England (no. 512).

Freycinet was left in doubt as to Bismarck's attitude toward the proposed European mandate for an Anglo-French occupation of the Suez Canal on the eve of the critical debate in the chamber, July 29, 1882 (nos. 463, 467, 475, 480, 482–484). The effect of the adverse vote was at once evident in France's standing aside while England defeated Arabi Bey and established her control in Egypt, although French diplomacy promptly showed in other ways and elsewhere that its policy was not to be one of renunciation. Tissot, in London, advised the acceptance of the situation in order to retain England's neutrality

(no. 539). Bismarck, according to Courcel's first impression, would prepare a new Congress of Berlin for England (no. 584), but further reflection persuaded him that England might secure Bismarck's support if the Conservative party should return to power (no. 512). *"Ni conflit, ni intimité entre la France et l'Angleterre . . ."* was Courcel's apparently final opinion as to Bismarck's wishes (no. 573). These documents as usual are richer in the reflections of ambassadors than those of responsible ministers as to the direction of French policy. There is here no direct evidence of a desire for an entente with Germany, except in connection with France's support of Austria's motion at the Conference of Constantinople that no settlement of the Egyptian question should be valid without the approval of Europe (no. 517).

Duke University. E. Malcolm Carroll.

British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898–1914. Edited by G. P. Gooch, D. Litt., F. B. A., and Harold Temperley, Litt. D., F. B. A. Volume VIII., *Arbitration, Neutrality, and Security.* (London: H. M. Stationery Office. 1932. Pp. lxiv, 797. 17*s.* 6*d.*)

Having devoted each of the preceding volumes to large, fairly unified subjects, Messrs. Gooch and Temperley have taken advantage of the present volume to bring together a number of small, heterogeneous subjects—arbitration, neutrality, and security—which fall within the general period from 1898 to 1914. It therefore lacks the unity, though not the interest and the meticulous and impartial editing, of its predecessors. As before, documents from representatives of foreign governments have been laid before these governments for their approval; "the response has been less completely satisfactory than usual" (p. ix). For instance, the French General Chamoin remarked to the British military attaché in 1909, "that all the large war games played by the [French] 1st Army Corps command turned on an advance through Belgium". The French government requested the editors to insert a note saying that General Chamoin was merely giving "expression to personal opinions such as are wont to be put forward in any private conversation upon the assumption that it will never be reported officially", and calling attention to a reference in the French diplomatic documents; this stated that in the early part of 1912 the French considered the question of entering Belgium before the Germans, if the latter's concentration on the Belgian frontier seemed threatening, and decisively rejected the idea, for fear of losing the possibility of English support. In an appendix the editors also open their pages to a characteristically vigorous denunciation by Caillaux of Sir Eyre Crowe, because the latter in a memorandum of 1912 expressed the suspicion that Caillaux was secretly attempting to come to an understanding with Germany at the expense of the Entente with England.

This omnibus volume opens with some additional material on England's

Mediterranean agreements of 1887 with Austria and Italy. These looked toward the preservation of the status quo against Russian or French encroachment. Lord Salisbury would not promise definitely that England would fight, but only that England desired to coöperate, the nature of the coöperation to be decided upon when the occasion for it should arise and according to the circumstances of the case. This was as close to an alliance as the parliamentary nature of English institutions permitted. These secret agreements serve as the introduction to the negotiations of 1901 concerning the future of Tripoli, English surmises as to the nature of the Triple Alliance, and a Greek proposal of 1907 for a naval agreement.

England's traditional close relations with Portugal, strengthened by the secret London agreement of 1899 for the protection of Portuguese colonies, and by the Windsor Treaty of 1904 for arbitration, find expression in England's taking the lead in recognizing the Portuguese republic after the assassination of Carlos I. in 1908.

More important is the long chapter on the consequences of the separation of Norway from Sweden in 1905. This led to the Treaty of 1907 by which England guaranteed the independence and integrity of Norway. The abrogation at the same time of the Treaty of 1855, concerning the integrity of Norway and Sweden, was complicated by the proposal to abrogate also the Convention of 1856 forbidding the fortification of the Aaland Islands.

Documents on the Second Hague Conference explain in detail the difficulties caused by Germany's downright refusal to discuss the limitation of armaments, Grey's hopes that the Americans could be induced to raise the question during the conference, and England's final proposal of the unobjectionable resolution that the question of great expenditure on armaments was an urgent one for governments to study. Here, and in the chapter on the London Naval Conference, interesting light is thrown on England's attitude on the rights of neutrals, prizes, and contraband. Closely allied with these subjects are the chapters dealing with the Anglo-American negotiations for a general arbitration treaty, and the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance in 1911 in a form designed to prevent Great Britain from being involved in war with the United States.

Most interesting, perhaps, are the documents bearing on the question of the security and neutrality of the two small states, Switzerland and Belgium. In the former the British military attaché believed he discovered some evidences of a very strong pro-German tendency, which caused him to send alarmist reports to London. Belgium also for a brief period in 1912 was feared to be lacking in firmness to live up to her neutrality obligations; in this connection there are published documents illustrating Great Britain's views on Belgian neutrality between 1872 and 1913.

Harvard University. SIDNEY B. FAY.

Austro-German Diplomatic Relations, 1908–1914. By Oswald Henry Wedel, Associate Professor of History, University of Arizona. (Stanford University: Stanford University Press. 1932. Pp. viii, 233. $3.00.)

To Mr. Wedel the Dual Alliance of 1879 was a step towards the solution of the age old problem of Central Europe. It was a return to the *Grossdeutsch* ideal after the *Kleindeutsch* principle had scored a victory in the unification of Germany. This was only a partial solution, for the partners refused to recognize common problems. To Andrássy and his successors the alliance meant support in Austria's Balkan policy. For Bismarck it provided an opportunity to dominate Central Europe, to the exclusion of Balkan affairs. Germany did retain direction of the alliance until Bülow, in order to assure himself of at least one ally after the isolation at Algeçiras, gave Aehrenthal complete support in the annexation crisis. It was this change in interpretation—Bülow's for Bismarck's—which through the course of events in the following years made it impossible for Germany to stand aside in 1914. "The alliance represented a logical creation only so long as it followed the natural situation, which was that it was a phase of the old problem of holding Central Europe together. In departing from this it lost its real mission and became something else which it was never fit to be. Bülow's choice was therefore fateful both for his own country and for Austria." But was not this support of Austria's Balkan policy just an attempt to hold the Dual Monarchy together in the face of new national problems, with the same end in view—to dominate Central Europe? The author evidently thinks not.

Mr. Wedel gives us a good account of Kiderlen's policy. The attempt to arrive at an understanding with Russia in 1910 is termed a second reinsurance treaty. Kiderlen's desire for a closer relationship with England is underlined. By his death on December 30, 1912, the strong hand is removed from German foreign policy. Emperor William takes a more active rôle, but the leadership of the alliance centers more and more in Vienna.

Mr. Wedel's appreciation of Berchtold is deservedly favorable. He has a good statement of Berchtold's policy during the first Balkan war and rightly declares that the Austrian statesman wanted peace. It is, however, incorrect to quote (p. 138) a memorandum of Count Szapary (Austrian Doc., no. 3991, which contains the count's personal view) as Berchtold's statement. In view of Berchtold's memorandum on the Sandjak problem (Austrian Doc., no. 4171), it is also difficult to see how Mr. Wedel can say Berchtold would have been glad to have Austrian troops in that territory in 1912 (p. 58).

The author does not follow a strict chronological order, which is at times confusing. The author quotes (p. 188) a document of February 5, 1913, as proof that Jagow was anti-Austrian at the end of March, when the international situation was entirely different as a result of Berchtold's surrender

of Djakova; he mentions (p. 200) Berchtold's desire to revise the Treaty of Bucharest (August 10, 1913), and then works in a series of negotiations dating from July as if they applied to this period. Various other minor slips were noted, which do not, however, affect the general conclusions of the author. In spite of a great deal of detail, hardly any reference is made to the Conrad-Moltke conversations of 1909–1910, the Haldane mission, the interviews at Baltischport, the Springe meeting, November, 1912, or the interview between Berchtold and the German Emperor in October, 1913, an interview which led Berchtold to believe he could rely on German support.

These criticisms, however, should not obscure the general worth of the book. It is carefully done, based on a thorough analysis of the great documentary collections, memoir and newspaper material. The elaborate footnote references serve as a virtual *Wegweiser* through the German and Austrian documents. The only unpublished sources used, the papers of Dr. Heinrich Kanner in the Hoover War Library, contribute interesting sidelights, although they add nothing of importance.

Bowdoin College. E. C. Helmreich.

Nationalism and Imperialism in the Hither East. By Hans Kohn. Translated from the German by Margaret M. Green. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 1932. Pp. viii, 339. $5.00.)

In his *History of Nationalism in the East* Herr Kohn explained, among other things, the bases of the new political structures created by the World War and the Peace Conference in the Hither East. In his *Orient und Okzident* (apparently not yet available in English translation) the problems involved therein were briefly summed up. In the present volume he seeks to present the history of this region during the past decade. The volume is, moreover, intended "as a contribution to the endeavor to understand the historical and sociological character of nationalism and of the forces which are determining the history of our own day" (p. 4).

It may be doubted whether the author has turned out a satisfactory history of the Hither East during the past decade. (The "Hither East" includes Egypt, Palestine, Trans-Jordania, Syria, Iraq, and the Arabian peninsula). Obviously, events are too recent to warrant the expectation of such a work at this time. Yet, in a series of chapters (V. to X. inclusive) devoted to the countries in question, there are some points of view which the historian of the future will find interesting. The Statesman's Year Book may list Egypt as an independent state, yet, in Herr Kohn's opinion, it is a "fictitious independence". Nevertheless, "in the struggle now going on in Egypt between the Wafd and the autocracy [backed by Great Britain] the Wafd will undoubtedly prevail and parliament be restored to its rights" (p. 113). Iraq he regards as the only territory where the mandatory system created in Article 22 of the League Covenant has been carried out in the spirit of that article.

As for Palestine, in spite of the fact that this was an A mandate, it differed from those for Syria and Iraq in placing Palestine on the level of a British colony. "The causes of Syrian discontent, which burst forth in the insurrection [of 1925], were not rooted solely in political conditions, nor in the destruction of Syrian hopes of unity and freedom, but in the very nature of French administration and in the suppression of all personal and political liberties" (p. 189). Somewhere between the extreme position of the self-appointed bearers of the "white man's burden" and the unbalanced diatribes of representatives of the "backward" races lies a middle ground dominated by reasoned observation. In spite of the necessarily tentative nature of Herr Kohn's appraisals, he has for the most part laid down his course within that area.

The work in one important respect is undoubtedly of lasting value. The author is eminently successful in making his reader feel the force of nationalism. "The East is entering upon an epoch in which nationalism is the highest and most vitally symbolic social and intellectual form. . . . A few years back religion was the determining factor in the East. Nationalism is not ousting religion, but more or less rapidly it is taking a place beside it, frequently fortifying it, beginning to transform and impair it. National symbols are acquiring religious authority and sacramental inviolability. The truth which men will defend with their lives is no longer exclusively religious, on occasion even it is no longer religious at all, but in increasing measure national" (p. 19). And speaking of imperialist methods Herr Kohn says (p. 61): "What is peculiar to the present era is that more than ever those who apply such methods cloak their lust for power beneath a veil of morality, and that instead of pleading the instinct of self-preservation, the impulse to expand, and the extension of national power, they put forward the appeal, consciously or unconsciously untruthful, to justice and benefits to be conferred on the other party."

The author's possession of the key to an understanding of nationalism and imperialism, his use of this key in unlocking the problems of the Hither East, and his observations concerning the value of these emotional loyalties to Western civilization place him in the front rank of students of nationalism. And in putting these ideas in an English translation the translator, Miss Green, has once more put us in her debt.

In addition to informative supplementary notes the volume possesses a valuable bibliography and an index.

Williams College. DONALD C. BLAISDELL.

Foreign Affairs Bibliography: a Selected and Annotated List of Books on International Relations, 1919–1932. By WILLIAM L. LANGER, Associate Professor of History, Harvard University, and HAMILTON FISH ARMSTRONG, Editor, *Foreign Affairs.* [Publications of the Coun-

cil on Foreign Relations.] (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1933. Pp. xvii, 551. $5.00.)

ONLY those who have attempted to compile bibliographies of the post-war world can appreciate the difficulty of the task undertaken by Messrs. Langer and Armstrong. From the flood of books issued since January 1, 1919, they have selected 7000 titles which have been grouped in ten main divisions, these in turn being subdivided into a total of 380 different headings. They have also provided an alphabetical index of authors. The quarterly lists in *Foreign Affairs* have served as a *point de départ,* but items of minor importance have been dropped, while very many new titles have been added, especially on economic subjects and in Slavonic languages; the annotations have been revised and often expanded. Documents of the League of Nations and government documents are generally omitted (because they are well listed elsewhere), as well as pamphlets and propaganda, but significant exceptions show how carefully the compilers have done their work. As the title is somewhat ambiguous, it should perhaps be explained that the subjects covered are general international relations—geographical factors, economic factors, international law and organization, war, peace, security and disarmament; the World War, including twenty-three pages on diplomatic history from 1871 to 1914; the international relations of all parts of the globe; and the internal problems of the various countries except the United States.

No selective bibliography will ever satisfy all tastes and demands, and since the authors recognize that they have no doubt made mistakes of both inclusion and exclusion, it may seem invidious to single out any section for criticism. Nevertheless, the reviewer has been surprised by certain omissions in the section devoted to the war and its antecedents. Among the diplomatic documents there is no mention of Dirr's *Bayerische Dokumente zum Kriegsausbruch und zum Versailles Schuldspruch* (Munich, 1922, 3d enlarged edition, 1925) or the Bulgarian *Orange Book* of 1919. The Englished *Official German Documents relating to the World War* does not contain the important second part of the German original (not cited), which is important for the military measures of July, 1914. Since many studies of pre-war diplomacy are listed, it is surprising not to find Langer's own excellent *Franco-Russian Alliance* (though Michon's inferior book of the same title is cited) or the two books on the Moroccan crisis of 1905 by Anderson and Hale. Missing also are the *Memoirs* of Izvolsky and Sir Almeric Fitzroy, the various volumes by Eckardstein, Caillaux's *Agadir,* the posthumously published papers of Moltke, and Moukhtar Pacha's *La Turquie, l'Allemagne et l'Europe.* The two volumes by Daisy, Princess of Pless and Klobukowski's *Souvenirs de Belgique* were perhaps worth including.

For the crisis of July, 1914, the accounts of the Russian mobilization by Eggeling and Dobrorolski, though pamphlets, should not have been omitted;

nor should Lord Morley's *Memorandum on Resignation.* The two *Gutachten* by Gooss and Lutz, especially the latter's, presented to the Investigating Committee of the German Reichstag fully deserved mention.

For the period of the war, one misses the second part of Cadorna's apologia, Marghiloman's *Note Politice,* H. P. Hanssen's *Fra Krigstiden Dagbogsoptegnelser,* and Captain Wright's *At the Supreme War Council.* "Justus", *V. Macchi di Cellere all'Ambasciata di Washington,* and V. V. Tilea, *Actiuneă Diplomatica a României* should have been listed for the Peace Conference.

Perhaps the most surprising omission of all is any section on American neutrality from 1914 to 1917. The fifteen titles on this subject are listed under five headings, which is somewhat confusing. The *War Memoirs of William Graves Sharp* are not included. When all is said, however, this bibliography is the best thing of its kind and will no doubt become indispensable.

The University of Chicago. BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Fall of the Inca Empire and the Spanish Rule in Peru, 1530–1780. By PHILIP AINSWORTH MEANS. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1932. Pp. xii, 351. $4.50.)

THE purpose of this volume is to carry "onwards the story of the Andean area from the point where it was left in *Ancient Civilizations of the Andes*" to 1780, the year in which the great rebellion of Tupac Amaru broke out. Mr. Means promises a third book on *The Andean Republics in Modern Times* and when that appears the student of the area embraced in the *audiencias* of Quito, Lima, and Charcas will have at his command a complete and definitive history from the pre-Columbian period to the present.

As the title indicates, the book consists of two parts. The first five chapters give a chronological account of the Inca empire and its vicissitudes from the Inca Huayna Capac to its termination with the execution of Tupac Amaru I. at the hands of the Viceroy Toledo. Following a description of the Inca empire in its last days is a narration of the Coming of the Castillians, the Conquest of Peru, the Civil Wars and other tumults which were the chief feature of the next twenty-five years, and the Consolidation of the Colonial Government.

The rest of the book, well over half of it, gives what will undoubtedly stand as one of the best treatises on Spanish colonial government and institutions in the English language. It is divided into four parts, the Theory of Spanish Colonial Government in Peru, the Reality of the Colonial Régime in Peru, Commerce and Foreign Envy, and Intellectual Life in Viceregal Peru, 1530–1780. In the first of these chapters the reader will be interested in the

author's conclusion that "the final form of the colonial version of the native administrative hierarchy was largely the product of Toledo's activities" while "the minor government . . . was an adaptation of the Incaic system, and had as its pinnacle either an encomendero or a corregidor de Indios" (p. 153). If Toledo's system had been properly operated, results would not have been bad, but "there was a lamentable contrast between the theory and the facts of colonial government" (p. 292). "In the early days leaders were too often of low social origins . . . with the consequence that they were enabled to act in the unpleasant ways typical of parvenus everywhere" (p. 291), the later Creole "nobles were not a great source of strength to the colony" (p. 210), and "the servants of God were no less iniquitous . . . than were the servants of the King" (p. 197). In his discussion of the Spanish Colonial Commercial System which "would be more accurately described by the term European colonial system in Late Renaissance time" (p. 218), the author shows clearly that despite foreign envy "the commercial system was carried on with some degree of success" (p. 241). This success was not so great, however, but what the crown had its bitter critics, especially the Marquis of Varinas and the so-called Don Vitorino Montero. In its intellectual development it would appear that viceregal Peru was somewhat behind that of its rival in the plateau of Anahuac. In Peru there was little blending of native and European architecture and it is doubtful if the Jesuit Fathers José de Acosta and Bernabé Cobo can be considered the equal of Don Carlos de Sigüenza.

Throughout the book the author's attitude is one of regret that the Incaic civilization should have had to yield to "Spanish culture, bringing with it Christianity and money-worship" and he proves quite conclusively that "the fundamental and universal source of evil brought into Peru by the Spanish was the money-complex whence arose all the endless misery which have weighed down the Andean peoples ever since the money-less empire of the Incas was shattered" (p. 12). In his criticism of the Spanish colonial system, however, Mr. Means is not moved by any Anglo-Saxon, Protestant prejudice as is shown by the following statement, "At the same time, one perceives that the English, the Dutch, and the French would have been affected in much the same way as the Spaniards in like circumstances. Of all the European nations to colonize in America only the Swedes seem to have been relatively free from mercenary and fanatically religious motives" (p. 289). Furthermore, he is not merely destructive in his criticism, in fact his proposal that Spain might have succeeded had she established a social system in which the *encomiendas* were "converted into permanent feudal fiefs, whose lords would have possessed full seigneurial jurisdiction" (p. 295) will give food for thought to all students of colonization.

The scholarship of Mr. Means is beyond cavil, and even more than in the case of *Ancient Civilizations of the Andes* the reviewer regrets that the notes are placed at the end of each chapter. The reader who lets his lethargy

get the better of him will miss some of the most valuable portions of the book. The discussion of the identity of Atahualpa's mother, the names of Pizarro's comrades on Gallo Island, the location of Zemuquella, the northern boundary of Pizarro's grant, the value of Atahualpa's ransom, the three saints which Peru has produced, and good Bishop Casas's importance as a propagandist are just a few of the choice morsels which will escape the casual reader. The bibliography of twenty-five pages is extremely comprehensive and prepared in excellent form. The combined index and glossary will be very useful to one for whom the Quechua and Spanish terms are difficult. The sketch map is complete and the publishers have done the reader the favor of so inserting it that it can be in sight all the time the book is being read. In his mode of expression Mr. Means is most happy and there is a constant vein of humor which makes even institutional history interesting.

Occidental College. OSGOOD HARDY.

Documents Illustrative of the History of the Slave Trade to America. Edited by ELIZABETH DONNAN, Professor of Economics and Sociology in Wellesley College. Volume III., *New England and the Middle Colonies.* [Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication no. 409.] (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington. 1932. Pp. xiii, 553. $5.50.)

As Miss Donnan aptly points out in her preface, "Economic sources do not lend themselves to concise treatment". The truth of her remark is well illustrated in this series. What was to have been the final volume, covering the slave trade of all the continental colonies, is entirely occupied with documents relating to New England and the Middle Colonies alone. A fourth volume is to deal with the Southern Colonies. The documents are, in general, similar in source and content to those in the previous volumes (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVI. 407–408; XXXVII. 763–764). There are, however, fewer reports of experiences upon the African coast and more information on the disposal of cargoes in the West Indies and Southern Colonies. The editor has wisely chosen to illustrate her subject by treating only one or two colonies extensively and merely sampling the documents from the others. Approximately three-fifths of the space is devoted to the activities of Rhode Island, one-fifth goes to Massachusetts, and the remainder is divided among New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. The disproportionate attention given to Rhode Island would be open to criticism were it not for the great importance of that colony in the slave trade and the masses of material available in the papers of the Browns, the Vernons, and the other merchants there. Even so, the reader is left in some doubt as to the extent of Rhode Island's trade in comparison with that of other colonies and the mother country. What proportion of the entire traffic did the busy ships of Rhode Island control? To this question Miss Donnan's documents give no clear answer.

The materials presented are extremely varied. Arranged by colonies and chronologically, they depict equally the fortunes and the misfortunes of the slave trade. An owner exults over selling for £13,000 a cargo that cost only £1800. A captain debits his owner's account with eight gallons of rum paid "To the Docters for Cutting off your Boys Toe and Curing". A factor in South Carolina complains of a recent consignment of "refuse Slaves", describing them as "a wretched Cargo", "a most scabby Flock", three of them "very puny Children", and six or eight afflicted with "the worst infirmity of all others . . . (*vizt.*) Old Age". Necessarily, the title of this volume is slightly misleading. A large part of the material really deals with the slave trade to the "Staple Colonies", and few of the Negroes whose transportation to America is described ever reached Northern ports. But because the ships and owners belonged in New England the documents are properly included here. Occasional papers show the imports of the North. Especially valuable are the detailed tabulations of slaves brought into New York and New Jersey between 1715 and 1765. Among other problems of the owners which the papers illustrate are the financing of the traffic, the insuring of ships and cargoes, and, ultimately, the attacks of the Friends and other opponents of the slave trade. But by far the most illuminating documents are those which deal with the traffic further south. The relations of local agents with owners and masters, the rates of exchange, the terms of sale, and the dependence of the market upon current prices of sugar and other staples are amply illustrated, though the items are often buried amid a mass of less significant data. The investigator of West Indian and Southern economic conditions, no less than the student of New England, should find here much to reward a careful perusal. When the fourth volume is completed this series will rank as one of the outstanding contributions of recent years to the economic history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Yale University. LEONARD W. LABAREE.

The Life and Writings of Hugh Henry Brackenridge. By CLAUDE MILTON NEWLIN, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of English, Michigan State College. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1932. Pp. vi, 328. $5.00.)

THE frontiersmen who cleared away the forests, developed the farms, and fought the Indians on the American frontier were followed by pioneers of culture who promoted the transit of civilization across the continent. Hugh Henry Brackenridge was an outstanding pioneer of culture in western Pennsylvania. When at the age of thirty-three he established himself in Pittsburgh, he had been graduated from Princeton, had taught school, studied the classics, theology, and law, written and published two long poems and two dramas in verse, founded and edited a magazine, and acquired a standing and numerous acquaintances among the literati of the seaboard. In Pitts-

burgh in 1781 he found himself in a frontier community isolated from the older settlements by the mountains and lacking most of the appurtenances of culture. His wide interests and his talents in law, politics, oratory, and literature made him the leading citizen of Pittsburgh for a generation. In 1786 he induced John Scull to establish the Pittsburgh *Gazette,* the first newspaper west of the mountains, and began a flood of contributions to its columns. When those columns were closed to him by political differences he brought about the founding in 1800 of a rival paper, the *Tree of Liberty.* Brackenridge was also one of the promoters of the Pittsburgh Academy, which later developed into the University of Pittsburgh. A study of the reactions between this man and his environment, his part in the civilization of a frontier community and the influence of that community on his thought and writing, should be a contribution to the understanding of the evolution of American culture.

Dr. Newlin's work, as the title indicates, is a literary biography. The author is interested primarily in illustrating, explaining, and evaluating the writings of Brackenridge. In order to do this he necessarily presents a personal biography of the writer and considers the influence of his environment upon him, but he fails to give his readers an adequate understanding of the nature of that environment or of the significant part that Brackenridge played as a cultural missionary in the wilderness. About half of the book is devoted to quotations from Brackenridge's writings, of which the most noted are his satirical novel, *Modern Chivalry,* and his *Incidents of the Insurrection,* a defense of his part in the Whiskey Insurrection. Most of the readers will probably agree with the author that these writings "are not completely satisfying if judged only from the literary point of view"—that the main interest in them is historical rather than æsthetic. It is unfortunate, therefore, that the author has not devoted more attention to the other than literary aspects of Brackenridge's career and to the history of the period and the region in which he flourished. The first of these lacks may be accounted for in part by the paucity of material, but ample material is available for the study of the environment. On the subject of the Whiskey Insurrection, for example, there is an extensive collection of papers in the printed *Pennsylvania Archives,* which was apparently unknown to the author. The book is interesting, well written, informative, and useful, but it is not a wholly adequate biography of Hugh Henry Brackenridge.

The University of Pittsburgh. SOLON J. BUCK.

American Population before the Federal Census of 1790. By EVARTS B. GREENE, De Witt Clinton Professor of American History, Columbia University, and VIRGINIA D. HARRINGTON. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1932. Pp. xxii, 228. $3.50.)

HISTORIANS do not possess a natural craving for statistics. It is a taste that must be acquired. Federal and state census reports are still unworked mines

of economic and social history. When they have been opened and explored and the profession has been trained to use their riches, then the work of Professor Greene and his collaborator will be fully appreciated.

Almost fifty years ago F. B. Dexter published his *Estimates of Population in the American Colonies.* This, although brief, has been an indispensable work of reference. But since its appearance many local records have been made accessible; diaries, travels, and legislative proceedings have been published; many of the documents in the colonial office have been printed or transcripts have become available. The preparation of this volume has involved a careful combing of all these sources for statistical data and the presentation of the findings in tables arranged in geographical and chronological order. The first step involved an incredible amount of painstaking labor; the second was done in a clear and logical way. General estimates of the thirteen colonies as a whole are followed by local estimates that range from "New England" down through the several colonies into the "Northwest" and the "Southwest", closing with the "Western Indians".

After admiring the comprehensive columns of figures, the reader (if he can be thus designated) looks in vain for the customary "historical introduction" which is to be his guide through the pages. Why it has not been prepared is understandable. To be satisfactory it would be a complete economic, social, cultural, and biological history of the colonies. But after working so carefully with their materials, even the general impressions of the compilers would be a valuable aid to all investigators. It is hoped that such comments will appear elsewhere.

Less easy to forgive is the inadequate "note on methods of calculation" which presents ratios for translating militia, taxables, families, houses, etc., into terms of general population. These ratios certainly varied in time and space. The family of Boston was not the same numerical unit as that of the Pennsylvania frontier; nor was it the same in 1775 as in 1765. An investigation of these ratios should be undertaken as a preliminary to further studies.

Every future historian of continental and local development will use this volume gratefully, and a student with broader interests can glance through the pages with profit. In every column he will see the expression of a cardinal factor in early American history: a young, vigorous, and growing population constantly breaking the bonds of the institutions by which it was curbed until at last it overthrew the whole imperial framework which hampered growth and substituted a new order in its place.

The University of Illinois. MARCUS L. HANSEN.

From Frontier to Plantation in Tennessee: a Study in Frontier Democracy. By THOMAS PERKINS ABERNETHY, Richmond Alumni Associate Professor of History in the University of Virginia. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1932. Pp. xi, 392. $3.50.)

PROFESSOR ABERNETHY tells us quite plainly with what conceptions he has

approached the study of Tennessee's development from a frontier community to a status in which the plantation had become typical of the economic life of the state and dominated its politics. The study of our national history in the large necessarily leaves in obscurity the development of the several parts, while histories of individual states, on the other hand, "have ordinarily dealt with local politics in a local way". The author proposes, then, to study the history of the state, not from the point of view of its own internal politics, but with concentration upon its growth as a part of the national whole; and Tennessee, he thinks, offers an admirable specimen for such a study.

As free land is the master key to the history of the United States during the first century of its existence, so also land (even if not so free as in other parts of the national domain) is the key to the politics of Tennessee through many years. Not only did the state inherit a land problem peculiarly its own, in a sense it had its origin in a land problem—or, to speak more accurately, in land speculation. Indeed the "Great Land Grab", as Professor Abernethy terms it, leavened the whole lump of the state's beginnings, and most of the upstanding patriots of the time were involved in it. It is certain, he declares, that Sevier, Shelby, and the rest were "seeking lands rather than freedom". Even that noble experiment, the Franklin movement, usually supposed to have been a manifestation of frontier democracy, was little else than a device of the land speculators for their own purposes (here every good Tennesseean will shed a few tears!), and even in its collapse the speculators did not fail to obtain their reward. It was a case of "heads I win, tails you lose". "The first offspring of the West", asserts Professor Abernethy, "was not democracy but arrant opportunism."

From the planting of the Watauga and the Cumberland all the way down to the Civil War, traditional heroes are tumbled over by the author like tenpins before a well-directed ball. Some of them will no doubt be set up again, but they will probably be a bit unsteady. And now arises a new figure, hitherto somewhat obscure, yet he does not rise, be it said, as a worshipful hero. His name is William Blount, and he was "the greatest speculator politician of them all", the real empire-builder of the Southwest. When Blount made a miscue and was expelled from the Senate, his toga went to Andrew Jackson; but the latter did not know how to wear it, although many other lessons he had learned well from his preceptor. Far from being a leader of democracy, a champion of the people's cause, Jackson's forte, in the view of Professor Abernethy, was in persuading the people to champion his. "He was not consciously hypocritical in this; it was merely the usual way of doing business in those primitive and ingenuous times." Jackson not only gave no aid to the liberal movement of his time, ably led by William Carroll, "but definitely set himself against the movement and its leader". Here and there through the years appeared a man who was sincere in his desire to serve the cause of the people, but his voice was usually smothered by the deceptive clamors of those who knew what they wanted—and obtained it.

After Jackson, when "the frontier had made way for the plantation, and the militia colonel had been replaced by the lawyer and the professional politician", James K. Polk becomes the outstanding and the typical figure. But between 1836 and 1853 there was no great progress in the cause of democracy. Genuine democracy begins with the election of Andrew Johnson as governor in 1853, a democracy "altogether different in its spirit and leadership" from any of the earlier manifestations. Professor Abernethy even makes bold to assert that Andrew Johnson was "the only true and outstanding democrat produced by the Old South".

Notwithstanding the extensive casualty list in the traditional honor roll, it must be said that idol smashing is not the sole or even the main theme of the book. On the contrary it offers a gratifying contribution to our knowledge of those aspects of life—economic, social, educational, religious—that are fundamental to the political. In short, the book is, as its subtitle indicates, a study in frontier democracy.

Division of Historical Research, EDMUND C. BURNETT.
The Carnegie Institution of Washington.

The Significance of Sections in American History. By FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER. With an Introduction by MAX FARRAND. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1932. Pp. ix, 347. $3.00.)

THERE are no surprises in this volume. More than most of his contemporaries, Frederick Jackson Turner was read as he appeared, and the publication of one of his essays in whatever periodical was enough to induce a searching of the files until the contribution had been found and mastered. His Significance of the Frontier in American History (1893) made it difficult for anyone who had read it to write the history of the United States again as it had before that date been written. He was unquestionably the historian's historian; he never wrote for the crowd or handled ordinary narrative themes; but his colleagues took instruction from him from the first essay until the last.

Because of his periodicity of utterance—and the intervals between his periods were all too long—and the fact that he revealed his truth as readily at a college commencement or a local historical meeting, as before the pundits, it has not been easy to view his output as a whole. He reduced this difficulty by collecting thirteen of his earlier essays as *The Frontier in American History* (1920); but he kept on writing and his readers kept on trailing. They now owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Farrand for the intelligent care with which he has brought together the latter half of the series. One of the editor's footnotes reveals the fact that there is forthcoming a posthumous volume, *The United States, 1830–1850: the Nation and its Sections* upon which Turner was engaged for many years, and which may be expected to continue the type of brilliant analysis and description that were the ornaments of his

Rise of the New West. But it is in the essays that Turner preferred to lay down and expound his doctrine.

It was a natural next step that carried Turner from the study of the frontiers to that of the sections. In a way, the frontier which he first saw was a sort of peripatetic section, shifting always with the recession of "the hither edge of free land", but ever retaining such uniformity of characteristics as to draw attention to frontier significance. Among the frontiers the uniformities were attached to a stage of functional process; but there are other uniformities, dependent upon natural resources or topographic strategy, quite as uniform, and Turner came to see them as fully as important. He foreshadowed his recognition of the significance of the sections in a paper which he read at St. Louis in 1904; he sent back to Wisconsin for publication in 1925 his full-length discussion, The Significance of the Section in American History, which provides the reasonable title for these papers of his later life.

Not all of the dozen papers that are assembled here belong to Turner's later life, but each of them has something to add to his great hypothesis. And in the one that concludes the volume, Sections and Nation, he passes from the realm of history to that of statesmanship and prophecy as he discusses what chance the American ideals have to survive, against the background that gave them birth, and in the face of the world with which they have to live.

The University of California. FREDERIC L. PAXSON.

Zebulon Pike's Arkansaw Journal: in Search of the Southern Louisiana Purchase Boundary Line, interpreted by his Newly Recovered Maps. Edited, with Bibliographical Resumé, 1800–1810, by STEPHEN HARDING HART and ARCHER BUTLER HULBERT. [Overland to the Pacific, volume I.] (Published by the Stewart Commission of Colorado College and the Denver Public Library. 1932. Pp. xcvi, 200. $5.00.)

WITH this book Professor Hulbert launches his Overland to the Pacific series, which is intended to constitute a "narrative-documentary history of the great epochs of the Far West". The book is also volume I. of Zebulon Pike's journal of the Southwestern Expedition of 1806–1807, closing with his seizure by the soldiers of Governor Allencaster near Santa Fe. A second volume, to contain the portion of Pike's journal covering his Mexican captivity and pilgrimage, is promised.

The journal, painfully misedited, was first published at Philadelphia in 1810. An edition considerably improved as to editing appeared in London in 1811, and this has been several times reissued, notably by Elliott Coues in 1895. The Philadelphia edition was reprinted by the present reviewer in 1925, and is now (in part) a second time reissued. Inciting reasons for this are the facts that the journal is necessary to the series Professor Hulbert has planned, and that Pike's original charts, taken from him by his captor in 1807, were rediscovered in Washington five years ago and thereby became

accessible to scholars. The information shed by these charts, reënforced by other collateral sources, has induced Professor Hulbert to undertake a fresh interpretation of the motives animating the expedition.

Herein lies the crux of the Pike problem, and its solution by the present editors chiefly gives significance to their volume. The accusation that Pike was a tool, if not a confederate, of James Wilkinson and Aaron Burr in their supposed designs against the peace and integrity of the United States and Mexico has persisted for a century and a quarter, sullying the repute of as splendid a soldier as ever wore the uniform of the United States Army. With a vigor and pungency uncommon to the pages of the sober historical monograph, Professor Hulbert repels the accusation, and in his pages the "Atlantic" school of historians fares sadly enough. Pike's mission was one of exploration; his ambition, to win fame as Lewis and Clark and Freeman and Dunbar were contemporarily winning it. In particular he aspired to become the delineator of the Louisiana Purchase boundary. He had no design against Spanish Mexico; rather, after undergoing prodigious labors and appalling sufferings in the mountains he contrived to have his party taken into custody to save it from complete destruction.

Such, briefly stated, is Professor Hulbert's thesis. From his pungent criticism of earlier Pike commenators, the reviewer, happily, is specially excepted. This means, of course, that the reviewer approves, in the main, Professor Hulbert's findings, and to some extent himself anticipated them in his edition of the journal published in 1925.

Here, it would seem, we might wisely conclude, but to round out the review some additional remarks are in order. Besides the first portion of Pike's journal, the book presents three introductory monographs: Professor Hulbert's general introduction to the series; Mr. Hart's account of the life and the papers of Pike; and Professor Hulbert's discussion of the purposes of the expedition. The work is handsomely printed, with attractive format. The four page index fails regrettably to measure up to the remaining editorial apparatus. A very few misprints or like trivial errors have been detected. The wisdom of dignifying with formal denial such muckraking articles as Kyle S. Crichton's Zeb Pike is questionable; at least, in the reviewer's opinion.

The Detroit Public Library. M. M. Quaife.

Edmund Ruffin, Southerner: a Study in Secession. By Avery Craven, Professor of American History, University of Chicago. (New York: D. Appleton and Company. 1932. Pp. ix, 283. $3.00.)

Edmund Ruffin of Virginia was one of those important personages in the ante bellum South whose life, opinions, and influence have been, until the appearance of this volume, incompletely known—an actor on the stage with a rôle partly evident but largely concealed. The *Farmer's Register* and his

efforts to revamp Southern agriculture, for instance, have long been familiar, and also his affiliations with the advance guard of secession. On the other hand his personality, the extent of his political and intellectual contacts, and the origin and development of his convictions regarding Southern sectionalism, have remained unexploited. Herein lies the contribution of Professor Craven. His method is unconventional and unique, for his book is hardly a narrative biography, though sequence of time and events is observed; rather it is a portrayal of cross sections of Southern life as they reacted on a personage, and this is done in such a way as to present Ruffin as a type of that group of extreme sectionalists, always a minority, who early and late desired secession and at last were victorious because the course of events worked in their favor.

Ruffin's personality was so full of contradictions that one suspects that a drift toward either nationalism or sectionalism was accidental. A real patriarch on his plantation, kindly and generous, with wide intellectual interests expressed in a large library, and a religious bent not dissimilar to that of Thomas Jefferson, he was also keenly sensitive, given to lasting and implacable resentments. He was never received into the fold of Virginia politics, and this he resented; thus the way was open for dissent not only with the political order of his state, but also, as well, with that of the nation, for the Virginian and the national political orders were closely related. Most important, sometime and in some way before 1836 he became suspicious and distrustful of the "Yankee", and this feeling developed into an obsession. There was also in the man something of the spirit of a reformer, and he became a crusader for such interests as the improvement of agriculture and the promotion of Southern nationality. It is not surprising that he found more congenial friends in South Carolina and the Lower South than in his native state. Indeed it was during his sojourn in South Carolina, as official surveyor of agricultural resources, that he definitely found his rôle as an apostle of Southern resistance to supposed Northern aggression and became in time an apologist for Southern independence.

Ruffin's environment—the plantation and the slavery régime—Professor Craven well depicts, but the contrast between Virginia and South Carolina might have been emphasized, for the greater diversification of agriculture in the former state must have influenced its lesser rôle in the effort for Southern independence. Likewise in the trend of political development the question of alliances between South and West, Northeast and West, and Northeast and South, might have rounded out the background for the movement for Southern nationality. For the proper understanding of ante bellum politics and economics an imagination which will supplement well-established facts is necessary—the kind of imagination that reads into events forces which the leaders felt but did not express. Hence the backward view, established long after the disappearance of issues, may explain many historic repercussions.

This fact the author realizes but does not capitalize. On the other hand he never falls into prejudice and is ever careful to indicate that all the forces which shaped the crusade against slavery, and also the desire for Southern independence, have not been analyzed and apportioned in their respective influences.

A word of commendation cannot be withheld for the skill and charm of the book. Always judicious in its statement of facts, there is a half dramatic sparkle in its style, which arouses in the reader anticipation for each succeeding page and chapter. As a combined interpretation of a man and his section, it is not surpassed and hardly equalled in the literature concerning the generation preceding 1865.

Duke University. W. K. Boyd.

The Life of Andrew Carnegie. By Burton J. Hendrick. Two volumes. (Garden City: Doubleday, Doran, and Company. 1932. Pp. xi, 434; 425. $7.50.)

Mr. Hendrick has written the official life of Andrew Carnegie. Unlike many official lives it is an excellent piece of work, scholarly, well proportioned, the result of years of research, and reasonably unbiased. That it is a sympathetic portrayal goes without saying; one would be less than human who failed to fall under the spell of the energetic and engaging Scotch-American who deserved so well both of his native and his adopted lands. Where could one find a character more superbly suited to the hand of a biographer? Brought to America a penniless immigrant boy at the age of 13, starting his business life almost immediately as a bobbin boy in a cotton mill, Carnegie became a division superintendent of the Pennsylvania Railroad at 24, and was receiving through fortunate investments a millionaire's income by the time he was 27. A pioneer in sleeping cars before Pullman and the accumulator of a comfortable fortune in oil when the name of Rockefeller was unknown, Carnegie turned suddenly from those lines of business with which he was familiar and threw his energies into the promotion of one of the most speculative industries known to man, the manufacture of iron and steel. Within fifteen years he was the most powerful figure in an industry, the development and history of which is part of the warp and woof of American civilization. A biography of Carnegie must necessarily be not only a personal history but a record of American economic progress for half a century.

To account for the career of Carnegie in a sentence or phrase is impossible. In many ways no man was more typical of the America of his day—his rapid rise from poverty to riches and power, his ardent patriotism which offended his British friends and won him the name of the "Star Spangled Scotchman", his strong individualism, his buoyancy, his optimism, his recognized position as the supersalesman of his day. Yet he was far from the typical American captain of industry. At 33 he wrote that the "amassing of wealth is one of the worst species of idolotry" and was already laying plans

to retire and devote his life to self-education and to benevolent works. Before many years he was doing this, living in Europe half of each year, studying, writing, cultivating the friendship of educated leaders, and systematically distributing his wealth. At one time the richest man in America, he had disposed with the keenest pleasure of nine-tenths of his wealth by the time of his death, and had made it almost a disgrace for a rich man to die without making provision for philanthropic enterprises.

In one respect the writing of a life of Carnegie presents little difficulty, for there were no intricacies in his mental processes to confound the psychologist. He was a typical "extrovert", open, frank, and enjoying to the utmost all that life had brought him. The difficulty is in adequately fitting his career into the American scene of which he was so intimate a part and yet in a sense so separate. On the personal side of Carnegie's life there is no reason to believe that Mr. Hendrick has not written a definitive work. Carnegie's character, his mode of life, the history of his friendship with Arnold, Spencer, Gladstone, Morley, and others is given in detail. For the first time also we have an adequate discussion of Carnegie's interest and influence in international affairs and his lifelong concern in promoting international amity. Carnegie's philosophy and ideas on public questions were fairly well known to his contemporaries through his own books and magazine articles; Mr. Hendrick's contribution has been to show the influence exerted by Carnegie behind the scenes. The book is valuable also as a connected history of the Carnegie philanthropies and their widespread ramifications.

Perhaps the most important part of the work is that dealing with the business policies of the great ironmaster and his significance in our economic history. Mr. Hendrick has made an important contribution as he writes of Carnegie's part in the development of the Bessemer converter, the adoption of the open-hearth process, and the opening of the Lake Superior iron region. Particularly valuable is the background which he develops of the sale of the Carnegie mills to the Morgan syndicate. Regarding the Homestead Strike of 1892 Mr. Hendrick adds little to what is known except in his development of the general background by devoting a chapter to Carnegie's ideas on labor and his personal handling of the labor problem in earlier disputes. His chapter on the strike is a defense of Carnegie which may leave some unconvinced.

Of historical flaws there appear to be very few. The author unfortunately swallows without hesitancy Roosevelt's own account of his activities in the Venezuela incident of 1902. Parenthetically, it may be said that the letters which Carnegie received and which are reprinted in this biography are among the most interesting parts of the book. Prime Minister Balfour writing to Carnegie at this time wrote feelingly, "These South American Republics are a great trouble, and I wish the U. S. A. would take them in hand!" Fortunately Mr. Hendrick navigates quite successfully the stormy waters of the war guilt controversy due undoubtedly to the fact that his hero refused to

recognize in the Kaiser the master villain who shipwrecked the peace of Europe. At any rate this is no small accomplishment for the author of the *Life and Letters of Walter H. Page*. The biography closes with a brief appendix on the so-called "armor plate scandal" and a bibliography of Carnegie's writings and of material on him. The volumes are excellently printed and illustrated.

Smith College. HAROLD U. FAULKNER.

The Rise of the City, 1878–1898. By ARTHUR MEIER SCHLESINGER, Professor of History, Harvard University. [History of American Life, volume X.] (New York: Macmillan Company. 1933. Pp. xvi, 494. $4.00.)

ALTHOUGH the covering title of this volume is *The Rise of the City*, the contents are by no means limited to a consideration of that phenomenon. On the contrary, the work is really a survey of "social life" from 1878 to 1898, in which the city itself, in a strict sense, occupies only two out of thirteen chapters. The book opens with chapters on the New South and the Great West. After this introduction come the two chapters on the city and urban life. Then follow chapters on the American woman, the educational revival, increasing the world's knowledge, the renaissance in letters and arts, the pursuit of happiness, the changing Church, society's wards, political factors and forces, and *Fin de Siècle*.

The sixty odd pages included under Urbanism do not present a statistical picture of rising cities; they deal with those characteristics which strike the author as significant or impressive—small towns, bigger cities, aliens, rural decay, concentration of wealth, contrasts, lights and shadows, congestion, utilities of water, gas, communication, and sanitation, hotels, lodgings, slums, crime, and general planlessness. The characteristics so chosen for presentation are illustrated with a wealth of detail drawn largely from original sources and literature contemporary to the period under consideration. And the presentation is clear, calm, and steady. Given the program, no one can quarrel with the scholarship or ingenuity of the author.

A similar conception has governed the selection and ordering of materials dealing with feminism, schools, colleges, and universities, letters, the arts, newspapers, science, amusements, athletics, religion, temperance, poverty, politics, and panics. The great phases of culture formalized under such heads as education, science, the arts, and entertainments are recognized and illustrated. Then these customary categories of thought are supplemented by impressionistic pictures. With what result? The reader who lived through the period here surveyed will experience the sensation of living scenes over again; he will walk once more as in a dream amid the sights, sounds, and smells of Xenia, Ohio, and New York City; he will hear again "the big, booming confusion".

Whether this movement and uproar meant anything then or means anything now, whether it had any center of gravity or was merely chaos floating in chaos, whether it had any direction, Professor Schlesinger does not venture to say. He steers clear of all interpretations—economic, political, and philosophical. Apparently he thinks interpretations are wrong, that none is possible, and that impressionistic eclecticism is the only resort of contemporary scholarship. He may be right. But that, too, is an interpretation, with profound philosophic implications—for those who care to go into the metaphysics of historiography. We may shut our eyes to the abyss of thought that yawns devouringly at our feet, so perilous; the abyss remains.

New Milford. CHARLES A. BEARD.

Our Times: the United States, 1900–1925. By MARK SULLIVAN. Volume IV., *The War Begins, 1909–1914.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1932. Pp. xx, 629. $3.75.)

MR. MARK SULLIVAN'S unique contribution to the study of recent American history has become so well known to students of the period, as to render unnecessary any general description of his purposes, methods, and style. It is sufficient to say that this fourth volume is similar, in most respects, to those preceding.

The period covered is roughly that from 1909 to 1914. The volume begins with June 28, 1914, and describes in fresh and realistic terms the "ways of life" and America at the time when "an event" was occurring with which "America felt Sure it had no Concern". The next chapter amplifies somewhat the spirit of America during the pre-war years.

An inevitable chapter on Henry Ford (and some sample Ford jokes) leads into a discussion of mass production and related topics. A novel and suggestive chapter is that on New Words. In writing this part of his book, Mr. Sullivan made a study of the additions to the language that came into common use between 1909 and 1927. Of the 299 of these words which begin with "A", he found that 221 were scientific terms (aviation leading with 82), while the remaining 78 were divided among other fields of human activity. Another entertaining chapter is that on New Influences on the American Mind. Among these influences, he emphasizes most prominently the works and ideas of Freud, Omar Khayyám, Bernard Shaw, New York City, and the aëroplane.

Approximately two-fifths of the volume describes the relations between Roosevelt and Taft, including the main issues of the Taft administration and the rise and decline of the Progressive movement. Many readers will find these pages exceedingly illuminating. In the first place, Mr. Sullivan was himself not only closely connected with the Bull Moose movement, but he was one of its more rabid promoters in the columns of the Progressive press. Study and reflection have largely modified Mr. Sullivan's position. A reviewer

may well leave thus indefinite the extent of the change. A synopsis would merely mar an interesting story.

In the second place, Mr. Sullivan embeds his account of the rift between Roosevelt and Taft in the solid foundations of human nature, and then rears a structure thereon which takes account of numerous *contretemps* between the two men. The reader will probably suspect that Mr. Sullivan's reservoir of knowledge on the subject is larger than appears. At any rate, his story has every appearance of being more accurate than anything which has yet been written on the subject.

To this reviewer, Mr. Sullivan makes an especial appeal because of sundry reflections or bits of political and social philosophy which are thrown in for good measure at divers points. Such is the pithy statement of the impossibility of placing a correct label on certain periods of history (p. 37, footnote on the "Tragic Era", "Gay Nineties", "Mauve Decade", and so on). Or the *obiter dicta* on the Freudian theory (p. 176). Or Mr. Sullivan's opinion of one of Mr. Roosevelt's speeches in the Bull Moose campaign (p. 485).

No virile account of so recent a period would be agreed to in all its details. For example, the statement (pp. 402–403) quoted from an article written in 1912, that Taft had "made more real and lasting progress than any two Presidents since the Civil War". There are a few typographical slips, but only a few.

This reviewer would like to suggest a one-volume condensation of Mr. Sullivan's four volumes, for student use, when a reasonable financial return for publishers and author have been met. Such a condensation might include among others the whole or parts of chapters 1–3, 8, 9, 14, and 16, in volume I.; a somewhat full synopsis of chapters 1–11, together with chapters 15, 17, 24, and 27 in volume II.; chapters 5 and 6 of volume III.; and chapters 1, 2, portions of 3, 4, 6, 11, and a synopsis of chapters 12–30 of volume IV. A volume of this kind would be of great value for college classes. In the meantime, Mr. Sullivan's four volumes complete should have many readers.

Dartmouth College. CHARLES R. LINGLEY.

Mary Baker Eddy: the Truth and the Tradition. By ERNEST SUTHERLAND BATES, Ph. D., and JOHN V. DITTEMORE. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1932. Pp. v, 476, xxxiv. $4.00.)

MR. DITTEMORE, who for ten years was a director of the Christian Science Mother Church and for a longer time a trustee of Mrs. Eddy's estate, had a persistent interest in Mrs. Eddy's personal history. In 1907, acting for the directors, he financed and published the work which Mrs. Sibyl Wilbur O'Brien was engaged to write to counteract the serial articles appearing in *McClure's Magazine* from the pen of Miss Georgine Milmine. Since that time he has collected a mass of letters written by Mrs. Eddy or her students and family connections, as well as reminiscences and diaries of her associates

and sundry suppressed narratives. For the present publication he has had the collaboration of Ernest Sutherland Bates who is responsible for the literary form. By virtue of its ample sources, the apparent critical skill applied in use of them, the obvious precision and order given to details, this may be regarded as an authoritative record of the facts and a final confirmation of their incongruity with the idealizing legend accepted by Mrs. Eddy's followers. Compared with prior critical accounts it gives a somewhat more sympathetic version of Mrs. Eddy's earlier years, emphasizing the beauty and charm which helped to found an amazing career, crediting her with more schooling than others report, acknowledging a natural gift of expression which, it is said, might have made her a writer of rank had not an indulgence in meretricious verse vitiated her feeling for prose style. We note also a rejection of village gossip representing her nervous disorders as deliberate tantrums in resentment of wishes denied. Letters from Mrs. Eddy's mother correct the notion of a household tyrannized by a child's freakish self-will. Our authors further refuse to credit the story of Mrs. Eddy's destructive fury on leaving the Wentworth home in Stoughton in 1869. They are impartial when they analyze the evidence for the alleged conspiracy of Eddy and Arens to murder Dr. Spofford. They agree with Mrs. Fleta Springer's protest against the inconsistent newspaper reports of the famous interview on Concord in 1906 and regard the reported impersonation of Mrs. Eddy when ill by Mrs. Leonard as intrinsically improbable and deficient in evidence.

This restraint does not mean sympathy with the pious legend. It emphasizes the view that after the death of Gilbert Eddy we are no longer concerned with an irresponsibly impulsive and imaginative woman but an embattled Mrs. Eddy deliberately bent on self-aggrandizement and worldly profit. Henceforth, "her methods would be increasingly ruthless, increasingly regardless of the conventional ideas of truth and honor taught to her in childhood". From that date the actors and their actions are interpreted with great severity, even beyond the necessities of the tale. Certainly nothing here narrated justifies the insinuation of mercenary motives in the service rendered by James Neal and Joseph Armstrong to the cause of Christian Science. Adam Dickey, called "this new tiger-cat who purred so obediently" at Mrs. Eddy's commands, fails to play that rôle in the one case of behavior here recorded; he refused Mrs. Eddy another dose of narcotic, declaring that it was no longer needed, "it was the old morphine habit" reasserting itself. Conceivably Mrs. Augusta Stetson was "ambitious and unscrupulous even beyond her leader", but how, without confirmation from her own utterances, can our authors know so much of her secret reflections and motives? The reviewer cannot agree that Mrs. Stetson's letter which precipitated her downfall really contains "an implication that her own rôle was that of a new St. Paul to the new Christ".

The truth which here confronts traditions is a sad story. Impressionable,

uncritical, enthusiastic people without definite method or standards of thought are dominated by a leader who in her public personality was a radiant being "genuinely god-intoxicated, rapt in a vision of supernal goodness, love, and wisdom" (p. 152). Her disciple Bancroft described her "as one inspired, obsessed by one idea, that of convincing her hearers of the truth she was uttering". This public self of religious ecstasy won the adoration of spiritually hungry souls like the meek Calvin Frye, the gentle artist Gilman, the George Barry who poured out his devotion in the poem "O Mother Mine", the rapturous women of her own type like Mrs. Field-King and Mrs. Stetson. Competent men gave up business pursuits to become her agents. All this gave a perverted development to the gospeler's self-consciousness. From disciples, who even when injured by her were able to forget and forgive the wrong done, she received and demanded a homage and obedience due only to a divine authority. Yet all the time there was a private self that experienced physical suffering and mental gloom in contradiction to the gospel which she professed. She denied the reality of evil and she was tormented by evil. The result was the appalling notion of witchcraft directed against her by her rivals in popular favor. A dissonance of contradictory selves and inevitable aberrations in conduct, a tragedy in this career. The reviewer is suggesting that the painful story should be told and read with more compassion.

Lowell. F. A. Christie.

SHORTER NOTICES

History, Psychology, and Culture. By Alexander Goldenweiser, Ph. D., Professor of Thought and Culture, University of Oregon. (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1933, pp. xii, 475, xii, $5.00.) This latest volume from the pen of Professor Goldenweiser is a collection and revision of his scattered monographs and articles which have been published in various scholarly journals during the last quarter of a century. The student of any one of the several social sciences will find some section of the volume which is of particular value to his field of interest. In this brief notice we can only call attention to those items which are of special interest to the historian.

These will primarily be found in the first two parts of the book dealing with History, Psychology, and Culture, and Theories of Primitive Mind and Culture. Here he gives us, first, an abstract and somewhat difficult presentation of the epistemology and categories involved in the psycho-cultural interpretation of history. He then treats of the chief theoretical principles bound up with the laws of cultural evolution, including a critique of Professor Teggart's *Theory of History* and a rigorous dissection of the theory of geographic determinism in historical interpretation. All of Part II. is devoted to a discussion of the theories of leading anthropologists and psychologists relative to the evolution of primitive mentality and cultural traits. This is an

elaboration of the last part of his *Early Civilization,* which was really tacked on to the end of that book.

The sections most relevant to the historian are chapter II. of Part I. and chapter I. of Part II., which present a splendid critical summary of the laws of cultural evolution, the most important theoretical contribution which anthropology has to make to the science of history. Here he examines: (1) the long popular notion of inevitable and uniform evolution of institutions and cultural traits, (2) the opposite extreme view of the diffusion of culture from original sources of invention and innovation, and (3) the critical appraisal of both of these interpretations by Professor Boas and the historical anthropologists. Professor Goldenweiser's material will prove difficult reading for the average historian, but it would be impossible for him to turn anywhere for material more cogent or acute if he wishes to approach the fundamentals of his subject in a truly scientific manner.

New School for Social Research. HARRY ELMER BARNES.

Epirus: a Study in Greek Constitutional Development. By Geoffrey Neale Cross, former Fellow of Trinity College, Barrister-at-Law. [Prince Consort Prize Essay, 1930.] (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1932, pp. viii, 137, $1.60.) This small volume, one of a series of Cambridge studies, contains the Prince Consort prize essay for 1930. The work—its title is rather misleading—is a chronological account of the chief facts in the history of Epirus.

The first chapter (Epirus and the Epirotes) describes, very sketchily in view of the meager evidence, the development of the Epirote tribes under Greek influence, the early supremacy of the Molossians up to the Chaonian domination, 429 B. C., and the early constitutional forms—democratic in Thesprotia and Chaonia, monarchical in Molossia. The second chapter (The Unification of Epirus) contains in greater detail the account of the permanent alliance of the Epirote tribes under the hegemony of the Molossian monarchy. The shadowy history of Kings Tharypas, Acetas, Neoptolemos, and Abybbas leads into the fateful union with Macedonia in the marriage of Philip II. and Olympias.

The third chapter (The Hellenistic Prince) tells again the familiar story of Pyrrhus, whose attempt to build up a strong Epirote monarchy out of a relatively weak Molossian hegemony forced on him the international policy of crippling his troublesome neighbor Macedon. The author concludes: "It is as a king of Epirus that he must be judged and in the light of his country's past history the main lines of his policy were sound enough." The conclusion, which is quite reasonable, is not, however, in line with the facts, for Cross's account makes Pyrrhus seem even more than usual the irresponsible freebooter. After all, the world's judgment seems justified, for even after an obviously sympathetic version of his career it seems that the most that can be

said of him is that he gave his people "for the first and last time in their history, a brief moment of fame" (p. 87).

The fourth chapter (Monarchy and Republic) is the thin story of the last days, of the end of the Molossian monarchy and its hold on the other tribes, of the short-lived republic and of the bloody aftermath of Pydna. The volume is completed by eight short appendixes on special points. The best of these are the second, Dionysius and Alcetas, and the fifth, on the Negotiations for a Peace between Pyrrhus and Rome. There are simple but adequate outline maps and genealogical tables.

Mr. Cross has given us a dull book which is not very new and which smells faintly of the very serious student's lamp.

New York University. CASPER J. KRAEMER, JR.

The Making of Europe: an Introduction to the History of European Unity. By Christopher Dawson, Lecturer in the History of Culture, University College, Exeter. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1932, pp. xxiv, 317, $3.75.) Mr. Dawson believes that for the last two centuries the history of Europe has been almost entirely written from a nationalistic standpoint. This has had the result of obscuring the underlying unity in its development and has had an unfortunate effect in promoting distorted political ideals and consequent wrong political action. As he expresses it: "We must rewrite our history from the European point of view and take as much trouble to understand the unity of our common civilization as we have given hitherto to the study of our national individuality." "The ultimate foundation of our culture is not the national state, but the European unity."

Mr. Dawson has chosen for his study the seven hundred years from the fourth to the eleventh centuries. During this period, which historians have frequently regarded as of little interest, he believes may be found the formation of a new society and culture as well as the "birth of European unity". He has attempted to give us not the usual history, but he has sought to peer behind the surface and trace origins and connections, stress important influences and show how European civilization was gradually evolved. The result has been an outstanding piece of work.

To the rhetorician and his educational work the author ascribes the preservation of secular learning. Without his influence "higher culture would have been entirely religious, as it tended to be in the oriental world outside China". Moreover, it was the classical literature and rhetorical tradition that "formed the European habit of mind, and rendered possible that rational and critical attitude to life and nature which is peculiar to western civilization".

Dawson believes Byzantine culture has been too much neglected as it did not fit into the history of classical antiquity, or the history of modern European nationalities. To it he attributes the "background of the whole development of medieval culture, and to some extent, even that of Islam". Another

interesting statement in which the author differs from the traditional historical opinion, is that "the Holy Roman Empire—*sancta respublica romana*—was the creation, not of Charlemagne, but of Constantine and Theodosius".

Pennsylvania State College. JAMES EDWARD GILLESPIE.

The Secular Activities of the German Episcopate, 919–1024 By Edgar Nathaniel Johnson, Assistant Professor of History, the University of Nebraska. (Lincoln, the University of Nebraska, 1932, pp. 278, 75 cents.) This delightfully written dissertation from the Thompson seminar formerly in Chicago is a thoroughgoing survey of the worldly activities of the German bishops in a period when unusually able men held the *Krummstab* to the advantage both of law and order and of culture. Necessarily much of Dr. Johnson's work deals with the political phase of these bishops' interests, their efforts to maintain the political and spiritual independence of their position against the crown and the nobles, to preserve and even to enlarge the economic bases of such independence. How the hierarchs came to be loyally allied with the crown under Otto I. is not so well explained directly as abundantly illustrated. So far as the text is concerned the titles "Ottonian generosity to the Church" and "Servitia episcoporum" seem not entirely appropriate, but the notes contain what one expects. The particulars of the secular life of the bishops, chapters VI.-VIII., on the bishops as civil servants, as soldiers and builders and as economic administrators, are admirably set forth. One misses, however, extended notices of the agencies through which the prelates managed. The *vogt* receives little more than a page and there is no notice of *vicedomini* or *magistri camerae*. The bishop in the border regions, Lorraine and Italy, and on the frontiers, was not less loyal to the Saxon crown than his brethren in the heart of Germany although his interests and the conditions under which he proceeded were different. The complex situations in these regions are well mastered by focusing the narrative upon outstanding figures, *e.g.*, Bruno of Cologne, Notker of Liége in Lorraine, and Leo of Vercelli in Italy. Hearty and kindly is the concluding chapter on Episcopus Epicurus. The sketching of Megingaud makes one wish Dr. Johnson had in other connections dealt at length with the crisp Liutprand of Cremona and the artful Dietrich of Metz. Regrettable only is the assumption that the host of secular offices so well performed by the prelates of the Saxon period in Germany is incompatible with sainthood. There is otherwise little occasion to quarrel with Dr. Johnson. On page 48 he credits Cluny with a bit more than is its due and occasionally his entitling of personages is loose. Only three misprints, pp. 102, 141, 260, distract one in the text and bibliography.

Pennsylvania State College. FRANCIS J. TSCHAN.

A History of Europe from 1378 to 1494. By W. T. Waugh, M. A., F. R. S. C., Kingsford Professor of History in McGill University. [History of Medieval and Modern Europe, volume IV.] (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1932, pp. xiii, 545, $6.50.) How does this volume, and the series to which it belongs compare with other works of a similar nature and scope? Obviously an English student-general-reader audience is being addressed, and the format is identical with the Oman series on England. In such circumstances it would be captious to criticize the omission of England merely because the American eye sees England as part of Europe. Hassall's *Periods of European History* is the work which the present series aims to supersede, and R. Lodge's *Close of the Middle Ages* is the counterpart to the present volume. The obvious difference lies in the greater emphasis on the medieval period in this new set. With about equal text Waugh provides twice as much discussion because he deals with only half the period covered by Lodge. Emphasis also is shifted. France and Central Europe get more lengthy treatment while the Italian Renaissance is, very properly, made less conspicuous. One notes, in this connection, what a large amount of research dealing with France has been done since Lodge appeared. (It should also be noted, in passing, that Waugh's chapters on Italy are among his best.) But will this more extensive treatment of fifteenth century affairs be more satisfactory for the unprofessional reader? In many instances the enlightening generalizations found in Lodge will be missed in this new book.

While most of the treatment is of politics the point of view is far from being so confined. There are several excellent chapters on economic and social conditions, and the author expressly repudiates Freeman's "ignoble estimate" of history. Even in his political discussions he injects penetrating philosophical comments, often very effectively phrased, on motives and causes, on personalities and general results, suggestive of the college lecture and pleasing to the academic taste. Particularly useful is the discussion of German political trends in the late fifteenth century aiming to show that the Reformation "only accelerated a process which had begun years before". This is supplemented by a *coup d'oeil* of the religious situation in 1500. Longer treatment gives some real idea of the complicated political situation connected with the conciliar movement without becoming unduly confusing. Unfortunately there is no summary of the movement's results, although in various places those results are noted as they influenced other events.

The author deliberately opposes some of the views of "patriotic French historians" who have tended to exaggerate the influence of Joan of Arc, or to palliate the actions or extol the skill and achievements of Louis XI. He likewise warns against English and French students who are "prone to draw false inferences from political conditions" in Germany. One may ask, perhaps, whether it was with intent to prove that "heroes seem rare and knaves

and fools abundant" that he presents more extensive characterizations of Sigismund and Aeneas Sylvius than of any other figures?

Williams College. RICHARD A. NEWHALL.

Československá Vlastivěda. Volume IV. *Dějiny.* Edited by Václav Novotný. (Prague, "Sfinx" Bohumil Janda, 1932, pp. 638, 300 Kč.) This is the fourth volume in a series now published in Prague, under the auspices of the Masaryk Academy of Work, which eventually will be the last word on all phases of activities of Czechoslovakia. The present work aims to present a critical treatment of Czechoslovak history on the basis of the new historical research, with special emphasis on the modern period. Each section of history was written by a Czechoslovak specialist in his field, so that the pre-Slavic period is presented by Josef Dobiáš, the period up to 1273 by Václav Novotný (the editor in chief of this volume), the period up to the fourteenth century by Otakar Odložilík, the years between 1419 and 1526 by Rudolf Urbánek, the period of reformation by Otakar Odložilík, and the modern period by Jaroslav Prokeš. Before the volume was finished, it was decided to include the treatment of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in a special volume, which is about to appear.

The main emphasis throughout is on the political events, though the cultural, economic, and social factors are not neglected. The history of Slovakia is included in the discussions only when it pertains to the general development of Bohemia. This is a serious gap, which will have to be filled very soon, because a work of this kind, which claims to be all-inclusive, can hardly afford to treat the past of Slovakia only in passing.

On the other hand, this is a book or real distinction. There is hardly a page which is not illustrated with historical documents, photographs, and reprints, in addition to occasional full-page reproductions and maps. Thus the book will be of value even to those who cannot read Czech. It is a book based on wide research, it corrects many minor errors of other writers, and presents a clear and straightforward picture of its subject.

A word should be said of the exceptionally handsome format and the binding of the book. Paper, illustrations, and type combine to make a volume which is a pleasure to the sight and touch—something which is quite contrary to the publishing technique of Central Europe.

Centenary Junior College, Hackettstown. JOSEPH S. ROUCEK.

Le Mariage Palatin de Marguerite de Savoie. Par Ernest Cornaz. [Mémoires et Documents publiés par la Société d'Histoire de la Suisse Romande, Série 2, tome XV.] (Lausanne, Payot and Company, 1932, pp. 326, 10 fr.) The marriage of Marguerite de Savoy to Louis IV. of Wittelsbach, Count Palatine of the Rhine, took place in 1445. From a political point of view the affair was unimportant, but the procedure throws much interest-

ing light on the social and legal practices of the time, and the author fortifies his brief narrative of seventy-five pages with two-hundred and twenty-eight pages of documents to make this clear. The negotiations begin with the marriage contract of 1444 and close in red ink at the death of the Count Palatine in 1449. The cause of the deficit was the size of the dowry which Louis Duke of Savoy promised on behalf of his sister Marguerite, a matter of 125,000 Rhenish florins, of which 50,000 were due at Basel when the bride passed over to the escort of her fiancé, the balance to be paid in three annual installments of 25,000. At Basel only 18,000 in cash had been raised and the duke was obliged to deposit with the city council a quantity of plate which he borrowed from his uncle, and to get various persons to go on his bond. Here we encounter the so-called "hostages" for debt, a medieval institution of which little has been written and for which the documents here given are unique for completeness.

During the next four years the failure of payments called these bondsmen into repeated use, and the kind of pressure caused by this procedure becomes evident. When patience was exhausted these hostages were summoned by the creditor to enter into honorable captivity at a designated Swiss city, not necessarily the same for all, and remain there until some settlement was reached. In this case, being personages of distinction, they came with valets and more or less of retinue, settled themselves in the best hotels and pursued a comfortable, if not a hilarious, existence at the expense of the debtor. One can understand the frantic efforts of Louis of Savoy to borrow money or effect a compromise while this expense accumulated. As one instance among several the draft on his treasury for hostages during 1447–1448 amounted to more than 5352 Rhenish florins, at least $30,000 in modern purchasing power. The documents include a variety of transactions, treasury accounts, cost of travel and transportation, and other matters which add interesting touches to life in the late fifteenth century.

J. M. V.

Politica Methodice Digesta of Johannes Althusius (Althaus). Reprinted from the Third Edition of 1614, augmented by the Preface to the First Edition of 1603, and by 21 hitherto Unpublished Letters of the Author. With an Introduction by Carl Joachim Friedrich, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Government, Harvard University. [Harvard Political Classics, volume II.] (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1932, pp. cxxxix, 435, $6.00.) All interested in the history of political thought are highly indebted to Professor Friedrich and the Harvard University Press for this admirably executed reprint of an important work that has been rarely accessible and has been discussed at length only in Gierke's monograph, published first in 1880. Gierke considered chiefly the general development of certain ideas (before and after Althusius) that found expression in Althusius's work. Professor Friedrich

offers an introduction (of a hundred pages) designed to give a fuller treatment of Althusius's own ideas and to examine them again in terms of other general ideas, particularly those that "have come into the foreground of attention" since 1880. Professor Friedrich displays a thorough acquaintance with Althusius's works and some of their immediate sources. His general discussion, however, contains a considerable number of trite observations, muddled interpretations and comparisons, and loose generalizations of doubtful validity. He suggests that Althusius's "strong belief in the force of sympathetic emotions among men" is due to the fact that he "was married and the father of many children", contrasting him with Hobbes, the bachelor. He asserts, without explanation, that democracy "can last only among men motivated by Christian and more particularly Calvinist morality", and adds these extraordinary remarks: "The disappearance of these so-called puritan morals threatens the ideological foundations of modern democracy. Again, the disappearance of these puritan morals goes hand in hand with modern psychology. Modern psychology is the acme of biological naturalism and determinism. Biological naturalism and determinism root in the Calvinist conception of God. As the terror of this God is growing pale, the order over which he presides is crumbling away. On the horizon of today looms the spectre of autocracy." He gives singularly confused statements on the relation of Althusius to Bodin, on Althusius's idea of the "natural group", and on the divergent conceptions of laws of nature as they appear in the systems of Althusius and Hobbes. It must be said also that the proofreading of the introduction has overlooked a good many instances of misspelling, eccentric punctuation, and awkward sentence structure.

The undoubted value of the book lies in the excellent reprinting of Althusius's text, and also in Professor Friedrich's contributions in the way of bibliographical information and a scholarly and illuminating account of Althusius's life and environment.

Yale University. F. W. Coker.

Les Sources de l'Histoire de France: XVII^e Siècle (1610–1715). Volume VI., *Histoire Maritime et Coloniale, Histoire Religieuse.* Par Louis André, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Lille. [Manuels de Bibliographie Historique.] (Paris, Auguste Picard, 1932, pp. xii, 462, 25 fr.) This useful volume is the most recent addition to that excellent bibliography which Molinier prepared on Medieval France, Hauser continued for the period 1494–1610, and Professors Bourgeois and André carried into the seventeenth century. It deals with the maritime, colonial, and religious history of France from 1610 to 1715, and in it the author, as in his other volumes covering this period, considers only contemporary materials of French origin. Nevertheless, the mass of histories, memoirs, journals, and other types of documents is enormous.

The book consists of two chapters. The first (ch. X. of Part III., dealing with the seventeenth century) is devoted to the maritime and colonial history of France. In an introduction the author maintains that the emphasis in the past has been upon the military rather than upon the maritime and colonial phases of French history. He then presents the materials under the following headings: the Eastern Mediterranean, the Barbary states, Tripoli, Tunis, Algeria, Morocco, West Africa, Madagascar, Ile Bourbon (Réunion), Abyssinia, Persia, India, Siam, Annam, Cochin-China and Tonkin, China, Japan, South America, the Antilles, Louisiana, Canada, Acadia, Newfoundland, and the Polar lands.

Of special interest to American students of history are the numbers dealing with South America, the Antilles, Louisiana, and Canada. Unfortunately the materials on these subjects, especially Louisiana, are skimpy. Moreover, a few minor errors are to be found. In number 4222, for example, Professor André, in discussing the *Annales de la Louisiane, 1699–1721* by Penicaut, writes that "they have great interest because they were written by an eye witness". As a matter of fact Penicaut claimed to be present on certain expeditions which he described, when in reality he was not.

In chapter XI., dealing with the religious history of France during the seventeenth century, the author seems to be on firm ground. In his introduction he discusses the importance of this subject and emphasizes the need for an intensive investigation of certain aspects of Jansenism, and of Protestantism. He also suggests a study of the revival of Catholicism during the early part of the seventeenth century. In this chapter he groups his material under four general headings: Catholicism, Jansenism, Protestantism, and Quietism. The first three topics are subdivided into general histories, general collections, and various special subjects.

This bibliography is not a mere dry compilation of innumerable titles. Demonstrating clarity of literary style as well as soundness of judgment, Professor André discusses the authorship, dates, editions, peculiarities, and historical value of the materials listed in the volume. At the end of the book is found a *Table provisoire* of author's names.

The University of California. FRANKLIN C. PALM.

France and the Colonial Question: a Study of Contemporary French Opinion, 1763–1801. By Carl Ludwig Lokke, Lecturer in History, Columbia University. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, no. 365.] (New York, Columbia University Press, 1932, pp. 254, $3.75.) In this volume the author advocates no thesis and draws no conclusions. He simply presents an interesting account of French thought on colonization from about 1765 to 1803. Taking slavery and commercial restrictions as the skeleton of the old colonial system, he demonstrates how a slight opposition to one or the other is seen in the eighteenth century *philosophes*, and how this op-

position rose to condemnation of both in the writings of Raynal. Slavery aroused most opposition. Just before the Revolution the idea spread that Egypt might make a colony with all the virtues and none of the vices of the West Indies. The Revolutionists were slow to recognize the political and personal equality of the blacks, and they never fully admitted the economic equality of the Creoles. When anti-slavery legislation had destructive results, France seemed weary of the situation and uninterested in colonies; but when Talleyrand and Bonaparte revived the Egyptian idea, it swept all France.

Dr. Lokke has used very little manuscript material, but he cites in his bibliography about two hundred titles of printed works. Sée's article, *Les Économistes et la Question Coloniale au XVIII^e Siècle,* and Mirabeau's *Ami des Hommes* (1756) are omitted, as is all reference to Quesnay, Gournay, and other Physiocrats. Some sampling of the voluminous manuscript correspondence between the ministry and the Antilles would probably have revealed a more intimate picture of official, mercantile, and Creole opinions.

The volume contains little new information, but its materials have certainly never before been so well studied and presented. The work is worth while for sharpening the lines of a picture we already saw dimly. A similar study is needed for the next half century, which seems to show wide variations of colonial theory.

Western Reserve University. CLARENCE P. GOULD.

Sieyes: his Life and his Nationalism. By Glyndon G. Van Deusen, Ph. D. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, no. 362.] (New York, Columbia University Press, 1932, pp. 170, $3.00.) The sinister taciturnity of Sieyès, his famous pamphlet on the Third Estate, and his cryptic epigram anent having "lived through" the French Revolution are doubtless sufficient in themselves to render the *abbé* of enduring interest to students of the eighteenth century. Yet so little has been written about him, particularly in English, that this small volume is exceedingly welcome.

Mr. Van Deusen has endeavored (and very successfully) to present "the life and aims of Sieyes as they really were". He begins by adopting the unaccented form of the surname (Sieyes), and devotes the first part of his book to a refreshing reinterpretation of the man as ecclesiastic, propagandist, and revolutionary. Then follows his analysis of Sieyès as the practical nationalist, "a Frenchman and nothing else", a man whose chief aim was the establishment of the "peace, prosperity, and predominance of France". And his conclusions may be deduced from the closing words of the final chapter, "His individual efforts . . . were not crowned by many startling triumphs, but his endeavours served to place him among the leaders in fomenting the nationalism of the Revolution, and that was no slight achievement".

Throughout, the work is delightfully readable and evidences a high degree of historical scholarship. Its few faults are of a minor character—a sketchy

index, a few typographical errors, a careless use of "aside from" instead of "apart from", inconsistency in the spelling of Rabaut, and the unfortunate omission of any portraits of Sieyès. Mr. Van Deusen is to be complimented on his contribution to the history of nationalism and the French Revolution.

Western Reserve University. JOHN HALL STEWART.

La Liquidation de la Compagnie des Indes, 1793–1794. Par Henri Houben. [Finance et Politique sous la Terreur.] (Paris, Felix Alcan, 1932, pp. 313, 18 fr.) With the most thorough analysis that up to the present has been applied to the problem, M. Houben has added yet one more to the considerable series of judgments on the guilt or innocence of Fabre d'Eglantine, accused and executed for complicity with Delaunay d'Angers, in foisting off as a decree a writing bearing the signatures of both which had never received the sanction of the National Convention. After an admirably objective examination of the data, he declares for the innocence of Fabre, aligning himself with Louis Blanc against Thiers, Ernest Hamel, and the regretted Mathiez.

Although M. Houben maintains a rigorous objectivity and avoids as much as possible a controversial attitude, his conclusions are very damaging for Mathiez's anti-Dantonist position. He has clearly shown, at least, that the case against Fabre d'Eglantine, which Mathiez regarded as definitely proved and with which he almost always buttressed his case against Danton, is by no means so conclusive.

Whether, on the other hand, Houben has proved as conclusively as he believes that Fabre was innocent, is less certain. His principal arguments rest on (1) the statements of Chabot, who did not need to know anything about the dealings between Delaunay and Fabre after he had served a very limited purpose as intermediary; (2) the statements of Fabre, which may have been perfectly true without covering the whole transaction; and, most cogently, (3) the absence of possible motive on the part of Fabre and Delaunay to practice deceit if they had come to an agreement—which is untenable as Fabre would not have wished to go before the Convention as the proponent of that which a few weeks before he had so violently condemned. Curiously enough, Houben, like Mathiez before him, has omitted to notice one important documentary item, the *ne varietur* signed by Fabre which appears on the final document in addition to his signature at the end.

On the whole, this effort, principally valuable as a corrective to the position of Mathiez, demonstrates again the futility and sterility of detective work and ethical judgment by historians. Two able men have labored to prove Fabre d'Eglantine innocent or guilty and the end of their labors is a Scotch verdict.

The University of Wyoming. F. L. NUSSBAUM.

The Corn Laws and Social England. By C. R. Fay, Reader in Economic History in the University of Cambridge. (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1932, pp. x, 223, $2.80.) As the history of the Corn Laws has been ably told recently after exhaustive research by Professor D. G. Barnes, of the University of Oregon, it might be assumed that a new book on the subject by a well-known English economist would be primarily an interpretation based on facts that have already been established. Professor Fay shows his competence to write on the subject. He has studied the sources extensively, as is proved by his footnotes, even if he has not offered assistance to other scholars by giving a bibliography. He adds some new details. He gives also an unusually interesting chapter on the corn trade, which he rightly calls a digression.

The defects of this volume seem to the reviewer to be many. In the first place it lacks unity of subject. The book is too obviously written for the purpose of bringing together a number of papers written by Mr. Fay for various scientific periodicals. It does not make a serious effort to weave them into a new fabric. Next, one feels that the author cannot see the forest because of the multitude of trees. Mr. Fay argues many points of detail, but gives few interpretations of real value. Instead of thinking through a serious problem to a significant conclusion, he expends his energy in defending classical economists, such as Adam Smith, and in citing chapter and verse to refute or ridicule the statements of twentieth century economists most of whom have proved the soundness of their scholarship.

Mr. Fay is not content, however, to remain among the practitioners of the "dismal science". He has strayed after strange gods and found Philip Guedalla. He indulges frequently in exaggerated metaphors and flippancy, and in denunciation, sarcasm, and ridicule. Yet he fails to appreciate the true gifts of his new master for brilliant interpretation and creative imagination, as shown in his treatment of the Napoleonic legend. The effect of Mr. Fay's style, unfortunately, is to weaken one's confidence in the soundness of the serious judgments that are given.

The reviewer is forced to conclude that *The Corn Laws and Social England* gives an adequate description of neither the Corn Laws nor English social life and thought; nor does it supply us with a serious interpretation of either. He regrets this because he is convinced that the author could have done both. The reviewer feels also that this volume is marred by serious defects in style and good taste, and he hopes that in his next book Mr. Fay will return to the high standard he set himself in *Great Britain from Adam Smith to the Present Day.*

The University of Michigan. ARTHUR L. DUNHAM.

Au Service de la France: Neuf Années de Souvenirs. Par Raymond Poincaré, de l'Académie Française. Tome IX., *L'Année Trouble, 1917.* (Paris, Plon, 1932, pp. 448, 36 fr.) Though this volume covers the period of

the German peace offer of December 12, 1916, America's entry into the War, and the Russian revolutions of 1917, it is singularly barren on these momentous events. M. Poincaré largely confines his scrappy day-by-day record to domestic difficulties: defeatism, suspicions against Bolo Pasha, Caillaux, and others believed to have dealings with the enemy, jealousies of politicians and generals, and the consequent reconstruction of French cabinets. In November, 1917, he finally had to choose between Clemenceau and Caillaux, and chose the former, more from a sense of duty than from enthusiasm. The Tiger instantly evinced his usual tremendous energy and determination; but his habit of reporting to the president what he had already done, instead of consulting him beforehand as to what he ought to do, evidently nettled M. Poincaré, who had not been accustomed to such treatment.

Highly interesting are the numerous references to the Sixte de Bourbon peace mission, which was regarded skeptically by Poincaré, enthusiastically by Lloyd George, and fearfully by the Italians. To thwart it Poincaré and Sonnino signed the secret "very short little protocol of Saint-Jean-de-Maurienne" of April 20, 1917. Another informal peace suggestion was for a negotiation between Briand and Baron von der Lancken through Belgian channels. But Poincaré feared it was a trap which might lead to negotiations without securing Alsace-Lorraine for France. He declared that Briand was a fool to entertain the idea, and that he would arrest him sooner than allow him to go to Switzerland to negotiate with Von der Lancken.

Though such questions as the Salonica situation, the need of a unified military command, and the amalgamation of American with French and English troops are given much attention, this ninth installment of M. Poincaré's memoirs sheds more light on domestic than on foreign affairs.

Harvard University. SIDNEY B. FAY.

Mes Souvenirs sur l'Occupation Allemande en Belgique. Par Auguste Vierset, Directeur du Cabinet du Bourgmestre de Bruxelles. (Paris, Plon, 1932, pp. 493, 30 fr.) M. Vierset kept this journal during the German occupation of Brussels. Throughout 1914 he made entries day by day, but after 1914 as he gave less attention to the trend of military affairs and confined himself largely to events in the occupied city, the entries are less frequent. The value of the journal is enhanced by the fact that M. Vierset held an official position in Brussels during the years of occupation. In the absence of the Belgian government, the Brussels council carried on relations with the occupying power, and after M. Max's arrest and imprisonment the position of the *Directeur du Cabinet* increased in importance. M. Vierset was fully informed on matters relating to Belgian policy, and he records first-hand impressions of the ceaseless friction and petty quarreling between invader and invaded. He traces carefully the consistent efforts of the Germans to overcome the national spirit of the Belgian people.

The author saw his countrymen and fellow citizens suffer severely at the hands of the invader, and he could not, therefore, resist the temptation to repeat numerous hearsay accounts of their "atrocious conduct". The case against the Germans was bad enough, and the journal would have greater value to the historian had the *Directeur du Cabinet* confined himself strictly to what he had seen or experienced in Brussels. After all, a simple statement of the German administration of Brussels would have been condemnation enough. The invaders showed a total neglect for psychological factors in handling the Brussels populace, and their want of humor, their abrupt and wooden manner, their endless proclamations and feverish persecutions, were best calculated to arouse the bitterest feelings of resentment among the Belgians. Even the public flocks of pigeons were under suspicion.

One interesting bit of German propaganda which the reviewer had not seen before referred to the British attempt to prolong the resistance of Antwerp (p. 209). The Germans circulated rumors that the British motive in attempting to "relieve" Antwerp was to force a long siege and insure the destruction of a rival port. The journal closes with the return of Mayor Adolphe Max to Brussels, November 16, 1918. Unfortunately there is no index.

Denison University. H. A. De Weerd.

Louisbourg Journals, 1745. Edited by Louis Effingham de Forest, M. A., J. D. [Compiled for and published by the Society of Colonial Wars in the State of New York, through its Committee on Historical Documents.] (New York, the Society, 1932, pp. xvii, 253, $2.00.) Five times in the spring of 1745 Governor Clinton of New York urged the New York colonial assembly to "become Partakers" with the New Englanders in the conquest of Louisbourg. His tongue-lashings were vain; there were no New Yorkers among the troops who listened to Calvinist sermons on salvation among the French guns of the Grand Battery or watched the mounting tide of flux and fever, after the surrender, carry away one after another of their comrades. The Society of Colonial Wars in New York, no longer "unconcerned Spectators" of New England's effort, have for thirty years been trying to atone for the inaction of their ancestors. This volume is additional evidence that the first capture of Louisbourg has become America's triumph. Seven out of the ten journals the book contains are printed, by kind permission, from the originals in the possession of the Massachusetts Historical Society.

The authors of these journals, seven of whom are anonymous, represent a variety of types and personalities. In that variety lies the book's chief value. One can see the expedition through the eyes of a sailor, an artillery officer, a parson, a member of the general staff, and five private soldiers. John Bradstreet is present with another of his place-hunting letters. These men were

not all "saints"; some of them plundered, cursed their officers, regarded mutiny favorably, ogled the French girls in the captured city, and mention "God's providence" not at all. But two of the journals, longer than all the rest together, were written by men for whom the hand of God was always present. Both are mentioned in Miss Forbes's *New England Diaries* and it is good to see them in print. One is made up of the staccato jottings of Chaplain Stephen Williams of Longmeadow, a fine type of New England clergyman, unsparing in his gloomy task of comforting the sick and dying. The longest and most detailed, printed from a photostat belonging to the Society of Colonial Wars, is anonymous. Obviously the work of a young man, strictly reared in the faith and caught by the enthusiasm of the Great Awakening, this record is sensitive and thoughtful. From the evidence it gives of the writer's family and connections, your reviewer suggests that he was one Luke Stebbins, son of Samuel and Hannah (Hitchcock) Stebbins of Longmeadow—the same Luke who in 1771 published a list of the descendants of his parents which is the first American genealogy.

The volume has a long appendix, in which the most important item is a series of unpublished letters from Commodore Warren to William Pepperrell.

Yale University. S. M. Pargellis.

Methodism in American History. By William Warren Sweet, Professor of the History of American Christianity in the University of Chicago. (New York, Methodist Book Concern, 1933, pp. 434, $3.00.) This is manifestly a work intended for popular reading, and in format and general scope it is admirably adapted to its purpose. A bibliography is appended which groups for each of the seventeen chapters suggestions for further reading, while a few footnotes serve some of the needs of the more critical reader. The distribution of space is well proportioned. The chapter entitled During the War for Independence is one of the best, but it does not altogether prepare the reader for the arresting statement early in the next chapter (p. 101) that "The long years of war had wrought a transformation in the attitude of the American Methodists toward the Anglican Church and their venerable founder, John Wesley, and the close of the struggle found them thoroughly imbued with the new American ideals." Probably what we really need here would extend outside the necessary limits of the book—a monographic study of this transformation in the light of recent 'Loyalist' studies. It would have been well to have given the name of "the Baptist minister of Bristol" referred to twice (pp. 80, 81), especially as the author rates him "Among the most able of Wesley's critics". Presumably the reference is to Caleb Evans.

The style makes easy reading. The ambiguity of the sentence (p. 46), "Often he (Fletcher) defended Wesley when he could not defend himself", is of course heightened when taken away from its context. Is the phrase

(p. 258), "an institution *of* which the church had nothing to do", a mere slip, or have we a survival in one of our dialects of a recognized Middle English use?

Every student of American history should be familiar with the influence of Methodism on American life and in particular with the process of the organization of Methodism. The title of this book suggests especially the former of these; it is still more a study of American History in Methodism—how Methodism has developed under American influences.

The Library of Congress. WILLIAM H. ALLISON.

Alexander Spotswood, Governor of Colonial Virginia, 1710–1722. By Leonidas Dodson, Instructor in History, University of Pennsylvania. (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1932, pp. x, 323, $3.00.) This book is more in the nature of an economic and political history of Virginia during the second decade of the eighteenth century than a biography of Alexander Spotswood. The author, by his exhaustive examination of the sources in this country and in England, has given us the first detailed account of Lieutenant-Governor Spotswood's régime, presenting with fresh emphasis the familiar problems of Virginia under the old colonial system. By the topical method each major question of the day—commerce, Indian relations, the land system, defense, the frontier, etc.—is discussed intensively. Although this treatment of materi results in considerable repetition, the author's emphasis upon action tak n as distinguished from theoretical implications and statements of polic (*e.g.*, the effects of the trade and regulations of Virginia's tobacco economy upon the landholder) affords the reader a concrete idea of the problem.

Spotswood's administration provides a challenging study of economic forces versus a dominant personality. To what degree could the governor, who represented the crown, execute wisely the imperial orders and yet retain the good will of the councilors and burgesses who were Virginians first and then Englishmen, albeit oyal to the crown? The author discusses this complex situation from many angles to show the intermingling of political, economic, and personal factors, and points out that on many issues the council and house of burgesses differed among themselves as well as separately with the governor. Economic factors are stressed above all—the Empire's war with Spain, the overproduction of tobacco, the expansion of the colony westward—as far-reaching in modifying the course of politics and society. Therefore, too, the author emphasizes Virginia's place in the mercantile system of the period, interpreting events from the imperial as well as from the provincial point of view.

Spotswood's governorship will ever be remembered, if for no other reason, because of his expedition over the Blue Ridge in 1716. All the glamor and excitement of frontier adventure have been associated with it, and, as

Dr. Dodson remarks, "the halo of romance . . . is by no means to be dissipated by the imputation of economic motives". The author maintains, however, that Spotswood's chief claim to greatness as an empire builder rests upon his encouragement of the westward movement of population; hence the romance detains the writer for only a page. With abundant material at hand on the personal and imperial motives that influenced the governor's actions, it is regrettable not to find a well-rounded picture of Spotswood the adventurer and the man in everyday life. The interesting comments on his character which appear are so widely scattered that they do not converge into one image. The economic substance of Virginia which Dr. Dodson has so clearly and comprehensively described needs to be enlivened by the social aspects of the colony and a detailed interpretation of the vigorous personality of Spotswood who himself became a Virginian.

The University of Virginia. LESTER J. CAPPON.

General Gage's Informers: New Material upon Lexington and Concord. Benjamin Thompson as Loyalist and the Treachery of Benjamin Church, Jr., a Study. By Allen French. (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1932, pp. xv, 207, $2.50.) In the present volume, Mr. Allen French resumes the process, so felicitously begun in his *Day of Lexington and Concord* (1925), of ascertaining precisely what happened on April 19, 1775, from a critical analysis of contemporary accounts. Using principally, though not exclusively, the Gage MSS. brought to America by Mr. W. L. Clements, he brings to light many interesting, and some significant, new facts. The claim (questioned in his earlier book) that the expedition to Lexington and Concord was designed to capture Adams and Hancock is disproved. He shows that while Gage indeed hoped that the expedition would destroy the stores at Concord, he had in view a larger purpose. Learning that much irresolution prevailed in the Massachusetts provincial congress, he sought to take advantage of the fact and also of the adjournment of the congress on April 15, to deliver a blow which would dismay the rebel leaders and disconcert their plans for a union of the New England colonies. Lieutenant Colonel Smith emerges from the newly discovered documents in a somewhat more favorable, and Major Pitcairn in a somewhat less favorable, light then heretofore. Additional, though not conclusive evidence, is offered in favor of the view that the Americans fired first at Lexington. It is now possible to demonstrate from British as well as American sources that no "scalping" occurred. The conduct of the red-coats at Concord bridge is described with a wealth of fresh, vivid detail derived from accounts by British officers. It appears that Gage was kept fully and accurately apprised of the sentiments and plans of the Americans. Two of his secret informants are revealed as Benjamin Thompson, famous as Count Rumford, and Benjamin Church. The former, who later became an avowed Loyalist, was suspected by his neighbors of com-

plicity with the British in 1774 and 1775, but proofs have been lacking until now. All doubts as to Church's treachery are dissipated by a letter in which he unmistakably incriminates himself. The duplicity of both men is proved by some ingenious detective work in the documents.

Wellesley College. E. E. CURTIS.

Life of John Taylor: the Story of a Brilliant Leader in the Early Virginia State Rights School. By Henry H. Simms, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History, Ohio State University. (Richmond, William Byrd Press, 1932, pp. viii, 234, $3.50.) John Taylor of Caroline deserves a good biography. He holds an important place in the development of Southern political philosophy, for his ideas constituted a "half-way covenant", a middle point between the compact theory of the Revolution and the metaphysics of state sovereignty. As Professor Simms shows, he was not the typical state politician, seeking office, building up a machine, profiting from patronage; rather he was an independent in politics, his principles of decentralized authority almost solely dictating his vote. These principles he developed at great length in four major treatises on the government and constitution of the United States, difficult to read, yet containing much good sense and sound criticism. They form his contribution to American political theory. His other interest in life was agriculture, and he ranks as one of the most important ante bellum agrarian reformers. Unfortunately for his place in American history he stood for an order of society and a view of the constitution which did not last.

Professor Simms has covered a great deal of material for this study; he has gone into land records, court records, county records, he has followed assembly and senate journals, and he has read everything Taylor wrote. The result is a very inclusive sketch, with chapters on Taylor as a lawyer, as a farmer, as a politician, and as a political writer. But the author has not assimilated all this information. The book lacks comprehension. In spite of the detailed treatment of his writings and political activity there is no attempt to grapple with the underlying philosophy of Taylor's ideas. We do not really understand him after reading this biography.

The author's style further increases the difficulty of understanding the subject. He has followed his notes so closely that quotation marks alone tell us when Taylor is speaking, and the result makes hard reading. For example: "Since gypsum increased the power of vegetation to draw from the air, it should be used frequently. He believed it to be of the greatest benefit to clover, then to corn, and then to wheat. The three-shift system, corn, wheat and pasture, he considered ruinous, for the land received no fertilizer, no rest, and the hoof did positive harm without giving any recompense." In the index Otis Skinner unsuccessfully substitutes for John B. Skinner, editor of the *American Farmer*. The biography John Taylor deserves is still to be written.

Agnes Scott College. PHILIP DAVIDSON.

In Defense of the Senate: a Study in Treaty Making. By Royden J. Dangerfield. Introduction by Quincy Wright. (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1933, pp. xvii, 365, $4.00.) This doctoral thesis contains much information about the history of treaty-making, the most important contribution of which is numerous elaborate statistical analyses, carefully and laboriously compiled and intelligently interpreted, on how long it took the Senate to dispose of each and every treaty which came before it, and the reasons for accepting, modifying, and rejecting. From this it appears conclusively that there is really less delay within the Senate in considering treaties than without, pending ratification. Again, and most important, that only seven treaties of the 787 to come before the Senate have been rejected because of the operation of the constitutional requirement of two-thirds instead of a majority vote of senators present. As for the question of the Senate and amendment or modification of treaties, amendments are always determined, before the vote on ratification, by a majority vote; and only 51 of the 152 amended treaties were never proclaimed by the President. The author feels that the greatest influence of the Senate on the President and the Secretary of State is psychological, a species of intimidation. He offers a constructive and sensible suggestion for smoother practice on the basis of the present constitutional procedure, which he believes it impractical to think of changing. This would be a "Foreign Relations Cabinet" to be set up by the President to pass on larger phases of foreign policy: the Secretary of State, the undersecretary, the chairmen and the ranking minority members of the Committee of Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and a senior drafting officer of the Department of State.

S. F. B.

New York University, 1832–1932. Edited by Theodore Francis Jones, Professor of History, Director of the General Library, New York University. (New York, New York University Press, 1933, pp. xiv, 459, $3.00.) The foundations of New York University were laid in the third and fourth decades of the last century. The period was stirring with enthusiasm for education of all types, and this was both cause and result of the educational advancement. Columbia College, having certain organic affiliations with the Protestant Episcopal Church, was unable to give light and leading to the general progressive movement. New York University in its beginning was the result of the devotion of the citizens of the city to the cause of the higher education.

The chief characteristics of the first decades of New York University have marked its subsequent history. Its enormous growth in resources has been constant. Its enlargement of the number of the teaching staff and of students has been impressive. Its increase in general power and influence in New York City has been broad and diverse. Its method of growth has been rather of

the type of agglomeration than of development. School has been added to school, college to college, institute to institute, department to department, all having for a chief purpose the meeting of every educational need of a large, ever enlarging, and diverse urban community. It has stood rather for breadth of learning than for scholarship; and for the service of distinguished individual professors—like Elias Loomis, Tayler Lewis, Samuel F. B. Morse, and John W. Draper—than for the service of a compact body of affiliated teachers.

The present volume considers the century under the terms of its seven chancellors: Mathews, 1832–1839; Frelinghuysen, 1839–1850, and the Interregnum, 1850–1853; Ferris, 1853–1870; Crosby, 1870–1881; Hall, 1881–1891; MacCracken, 1891–1910; Chancellor Brown's Administration, 1911–. Of these seven chancellors the last four have left the clearest impression. Howard Crosby, serving also as pastor of a large church, might be called a scholarly idealist. Hall, like Crosby, a Presbyterian clergyman, was distinguished by abounding common sense. MacCracken gave solidity and academic standing. And Brown, whose long term, and longest, is now coming to its end, has helped to bring unity, as well as additions, to these separated and divergent parts. The general atmosphere and loyalties, moreover, which the retiring chancellor has contributed, have served to give a coherence to New York University which no series of formal organizations could achieve.

This history is a succinct record of many facts, of risings and of fallings of devotion on the part of each of the different institutional members of the university, and of difficulties financial, personal, administrative. But it is also a record which, moving through each administration, constantly comes into a richer field of academic and of popular interest, into a more ample understanding of university problems, and into a more regular and consistent application of university forces and methods to the life of a great metropolis.

Western Reserve University. CHARLES F. THWING.

Pioneer Days in Arizona: from the Spanish Occupation to Statehood. By Frank C. Lockwood, University of Arizona. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1932, pp. xiv, 387, $4.00.) Interested in the folk lore of old Mexican communities, captivated by the tales of reminiscing pioneers, infatuated by the desert and mountain and "turquoise sky" and "gemlike constellations" of his adopted state, the author of *Pioneer Days in Arizona* has found in the "magic and mystery" of it all material for a series of fascinating episodes. It has been his "aim to tell the truth", to tell it "interestingly", and to give "intimacy and vividness" to his "stories . . . so that the characters may be seen as they were, moving against their proper background of native adventure, comedy and tragedy". To assure the accomplishment of his purpose he has "saturated" his mind with the literature of the Southwest and utilized extensively materials collected from interviews with "scores" of early settlers, who were "leading actors" in the events related.

The facts which the author found at the beginning of his investigations "as elusive as the desert mirages" have been cleared up to his own satisfaction. The student would frequently like to have specific citations, but the work was written for the general reader rather than for the specialist. It is really made up of a series of entertaining narratives, each more or less independent of the others. The Spanish Cavaliers, The Mission Fathers, American Hunters and Trappers, Scientific Expeditions of the Fifties, The Story of Apache Warfare, Crimes and Courts, Towns and Cities, Newspapers, Books and Libraries—such are the titles of important chapters. In these chapters many an Arizona pioneer and his descendants will find their names inscribed. They will be proud too, in most instances, of the parts they have been made to play in the stirring incidents recorded in these pages. But the historian, working over this period, will want to use again the material listed in the chapter on Newspapers, Books, and Libraries.

The volume is illustrated, the frontispiece being a portrait of the author. There is a good index.

Mills College. CARDINAL GOODWIN.

Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Brazil. By Lawrence F. Hill, Ph. D., Associate Professor in the Ohio State University. (Durham, Duke University Press, 1932, pp. x, 322, $3.50.) Friendship between Brazil and the United States seems a well-established tradition. Professor Hill shows little basis for this during the first half century of direct intercourse. Diplomacy got off on the wrong foot while the Portuguese court resided at Rio de Janeiro, and our second war with Great Britain and hostilities in the La Plata area did not improve conditions. Earlier commercial claims and allied grievances caused bickerings that were intensified by complications arising from the African slave trade, the operations of Confederate cruisers and the presence of Confederate immigrants, and the conduct of the Paraguayan War. With respect to that struggle Mr. Hill presents a needed corrective to the usual interpretation.

Major derelictions, after the initial false moves, are attributed to Henry A. Wise and James Watson Webb. Even the opening of the Amazon, the exploration of that river, and the effort to settle disputes over its terrain aroused distrust of our motives. Reciprocity and valorization served to complicate commercial matters. Nevertheless the story is not wholly one of ineptitude and ill temper. William Tudor's life was not a vain sacrifice. Agassiz proved an abler unofficial agent of good will than his fellow scientist Maury, and Dom Pedro surpassed them both. It also helped to have a Brazilian on the arbitration tribunal at Geneva and above all to have our representatives keep in closer touch with the State Department.

Professor Hill has made extensive use of the printed sources and newspapers and of the manuscripts in the State Department and the Library of

Congress. His list of secondary books and articles is a long one, including some French, Spanish, and Portuguese titles. He frankly tells us that he has not examined foreign archives. Life is too short for this, nor are these repositories open late enough to tell more than half of the story. Within this self-imposed limitation he has given us a commendable narrative. "Deodora" (p. 272) is a slip, but otherwise proof reading and press work seems impeccable. The index and bibliography are adequate.

I. J. C.

The Presbyterian Churches and the Federal Union, 1861–1869. By Lewis G. Vander Velde, University of Michigan. [Harvard Historical Studies, volume XXXIII.] (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1932, pp. xv, 575, $5.00.) The appearance of this elaborate study of the Presbyterian Churches in their relation to the Federal Union during the Civil War period bears testimony to the rapidly growing interest among those who direct historical research in the social and religious phases of American history. Three decades ago candidates for the doctorate in American history, in any of our major universities, would have found slight encouragement to undertake such a study. In more recent years such studies have become increasingly frequent with the happy result that to-day a much more complete picture of American life is possible than ever before.

Those who undertake such studies will generally find materials most abundant, though often greatly scattered. In fact Mr. Vander Velde tells us that he found his materials "discourageingly extensive". The research student will also find it necessary to understand the peculiar nomenclature, as well as the functions of the several officials and governing bodies of the particular church he may have chosen. In the present instance the author has succeeded most admirably in dealing with a great mass of highly technical materials, and has produced a book of much more than denominational interest.

The author has chosen to limit his study to the years 1861 to 1869; the first the date of the division of the Old School body into Northern and Southern churches; the latter the year of the reunion of the Old School and New School churches in the North.

In the discussion of these years in Presbyterian history Mr. Vander Velde has followed the most obvious organization of his extensive materials. Part I. contains one chapter devoted to a hurried, though generally accurate survey of the history of American Presbyterianism from the establishment of the first congregation in 1683 to the outbreak of the Civil War. This the author accomplishes in seventeen pages. Part II. discusses the Old School Presbyterian Church in its relation to the Civil War, in eight chapters under such headings as The Old School Presbyterian Church faces a Crisis, The Voice of the Old School Press, Revolt in the Border States, The Voice of the Old School Pulpit, etc. This makes up the major and by far the best portion of

the book. Part III. contains one chapter on The New School Presbyterian Church and the Civil War; Part IV. deals in one chapter with the minor Presbyterian churches in their relations to the Civil War; Part V., also in one chapter, discusses Presbyterian patriotism in practice; while Part VI., entitled Reunion recounts the steps leading to the drawing together of the Old School and New School bodies in the North in the years immediately following the War.

The principal defect of the book lies in the fact that no adequate study has yet been made of the slavery controversy within the Presbyterian churches previous to 1861. Such a study would have yielded most valuable information in regard to the attitudes of important leaders as well as the position occupied by the several Presbyterian bodies.

The University of Chicago. WILLIAM W. SWEET.

Gouverneur Kemble Warren: the Life and Letters of an American Soldier, 1830–1882. By Emerson Gifford Taylor. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1932, pp. xii, 256, $5.00.) This book presents a delightful picture of a personality, but as a critical history or biography it has little value. By the use of frequent and extensive quotations from his personal correspondence, Warren is portrayed as a lovable, sincere, hard working, and conscientious man and soldier. The book, however, does not do justice to his very real ability as a strategist, nor is there any examination of his tactical leadership. This is an idealistic sketch that considers Warren only in superlatives; there is no critical discussion of his conduct and leadership.

From Gettysburg until the close of the battle of Five Forks in April, 1865, Warren was a corps commander. His relief at the close of the successful operations, conducted largely under his leadership and direction, that directly caused Lee's surrender a few days later, came to form one of the "causes celèbres" of the Northern conduct of the war. From this time until shortly before his death, at the early age of 52, Warren sought unceasingly for a fair hearing. Not until Grant's control of the military affairs of the country had begun to relax, did a court of inquiry consider the case fairly and render a verdict. The final outcome was altogether favorable to Warren.

For nearly a year Warren and Meade had been increasingly petulant and condescending toward each other. On June 20, 1864, from in front of Petersburg, Warren had written his wife: "A rupture is probable between me and General Meade, who has become very irritable and unreasonable of late, and with whom I had a square understanding to-day—to the effect that I was no creature of his" (p. 180)—this from a subordinate in relation to his superior, an army commander. The feeling, with intervals of calm, continued, but relations went from bad to worse. The author gives the impression that Warren was persecuted by Meade and Grant. Warren is always right and there is no attempt to examine the reasons for his unsatisfactory

relations with Meade and Grant. Sheridan's decision at Five Forks was impulsively made and, perhaps, was due as much to nervous fatigue and excitement and to personal dislike for Warren as to any real cause for complaint on account of Warren's leadership. The author's account of the controversy and of the action of the court of inquiry is sketchy and unconvincing. No effort is made to get at both sides of the controversy. There is no critical discussion, nor does any use appear to have been made of the voluminous reports and discussions of the case. The book is based almost entirely on Warren's "letters, journals and other personal papers". There are few notes and no bibliography. There are no maps, but there is an index.

Great Neck, New York. THOMAS ROBSON HAY.

Desertion of Alabama Troops from the Confederate Army: a Study in Sectionalism. By Bessie Martin, Ph. D., Professor of History in Judson College. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, no. 378.] (New York, Columbia University Press, 1932, pp. 281, $4.50.) Miss Martin has presented an admirable piece of research, thorough, exhaustive, and painstaking. She has used not only a vast array of printed materials, but has also sifted the manuscript collections in Washington as well as in the Alabama state archives. The subject is handled in eight chapters: an introductory chapter defining and classifying deserters; a chapter on their distribution; two chapters analyzing the causes; two chapters on the efforts to check the evil; a chapter on desertion to the enemy; and a very brief concluding chapter, attempting to estimate the importance of desertion.

The essential contribution of the book, as the title indicates, lies in the sectionalism revealed in Alabama and in the connection established between desertion and the poor, sparsely-settled counties of the mountainous northern part and the swampy section of southeast Alabama as opposed to the rich, prosperous Black Belt where there were very few deserters. Five maps designed to present graphically the relation of the deserter movement to the per-capita payment of taxes, to the slaveholding families, and to the indigent families of soldiers, are suggestive and interesting. Valuable also is the material on the peace movement in this state and the fresh detail on war philanthropy.

The desire to prevent desertion was undoubtedly a factor in the effort to care for the indigent families of soldiers, but it would seem that the writer does not make sufficient allowance for the other motives which actuated relief measures—gratitude and ordinary humanity. It may be questioned whether a just sense of proportion would allow twenty-six pages to a discussion of relief methods in a study of desertion. An error of method should be noted. Newspapers are repeatedly cited through another paper, even where the writer proves by other references that she is familiar with the file of the original paper. The book is very free from typographical errors,

though, as usual, Buel suffers perversions of spelling (pp. 152, 255). The index, though brief, may prove adequate for so specialized a subject, and is fairly well classified.

Goucher College. ELLA LONN.

The Era of the Muckrakers. By C. C. Regier, Ph. D. (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1932, pp. xi, 254, $2.50.) This work presents in readable form a survey of the literature of "exposure and reform" as it appeared in popular magazines in the United States during the first decade of the twentieth century. The ten chapters treating as many phases of the main topic are preceded by four chapters on antecedent conditions and are followed by one on estimates of the results of muckraking. Defining muckraking "as the exposing of evils and corruption for the real or ostensible purpose of promoting righteousness and social justice", and quoting with apparent approval a suggestion that "Jesus was one of the greatest muckrakers", the author concludes that the achievement of a long list of political, economic, and social reforms between 1900 and 1915 was largely due to muckrakers. The method of the book is to describe and characterize through summaries the flood of periodical articles, and a few books, which made attacks upon real or imagined abuses in American life and upon their instigators and beneficiaries. Here are familiar names of sundry magazines and their many special writers who supplied millions of homes twenty to thirty years ago with eagerly read sensational indictments of malefactors public and private. Only to a limited extent does the author give his readers his reactions on the validity of muckraking charges, for he concerns himself almost wholly with indictments rather than with reasoned verdicts after impartial investigations. Such opinions as are expressed are not supported by citation of evidence. There are no footnotes or other indications of critical evaluations made of sources which should prove or disprove charges. Briefly noticing problems and abuses which now confront the American people, the author expresses his belief that the service of muckrakers is again needed. Yet he admits that muckraking was to a considerable extent "little more than a fad", a capitalization of sensationalism, "essentially a superficial attack upon fundamental problems". A judicious reader will conclude that this interesting sketch of a significant social phenomenon does not preclude further scholarly researches in its field.

C. A. D.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The program for the meeting of the American Historical Association at Urbana, Illinois, on December 27, 28, and 29, is in preparation. At a meeting of the Program Committee held in New York City, early in April, the decision was reached to devote more time than usual to general sessions. Arrangements are accordingly being made for general sessions on the evening of December 27 and the forenoons of December 28 and 29, in addition to the session devoted to the address of President Charles A. Beard on the evening of December 28. Topics to be discussed at the general sessions will be the transit of civilization from Europe to America, dictatorships in Europe and America, and economic depressions and recoveries. The president's address will probably be concerned with some phase of the philosophy of history. A joint session will be held with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. Arrangements are also being made for numerous meetings of research groups to consider topics in such fields of history as Ancient, Modern European, English, American, Hispanic-American, and the Near East. Suggestions or inquiries concerning the program may be addressed to the chairman of the Program Committee, Professor W. S. Robertson, of the University of Illinois, or to Dr. Conyers Read, Executive Secretary of the American Historical Association, 226 South 16th Street, Philadelphia. The local arrangements are in charge of a committee headed by Dean Albert J. Harno of the Law School of the University of Illinois.

The Executive Secretary's Report on the Availability of Unpublished Ph. D. Theses in History:

The Executive Council of the American Historical Association directed the Executive Secretary of the Association to recommend to the deans of American graduate schools that they require "the deposit in the university library of two copies of doctoral dissertations (in history), so that one might be lent to outside scholars".

The Executive Secretary transmitted this recommendation and at the same time addressed a letter of inquiry to the deans of graduate schools incorporating the following specific questions:

1. What arrangement do you make for rendering doctoral dissertations accessible to scholars?
2. If you require the publication of doctoral dissertations, must this requirement be met before the degree is conferred? If not, then within a definite period thereafter? Please state your actual practice if it differs from your formal regulations in this regard.

Replies were received from practically every institution addressed. Many reported that they had never conferred a Ph. D. in history, and their replies have not been incorporated in the following summary.

It was very gratifying to discover that the practice in graduate schools of providing a duplicate copy of the unpublished thesis for circulation under proper restrictions (generally through inter-library loans) was much more general than had been supposed. It is true of the following institutions with one exception. That one exception has only one copy of the thesis in the library, but allows it to go out to scholars under proper restrictions.

Boston University
Brown University
Bryn Mawr College
California, University of
Chicago, University of
Clark University
Colorado, University of
Cornell University
Duke University
Fordham University
George Washington University
Illinois, University of
Indiana University
Iowa, University of
Johns Hopkins University
Kansas, University of
Louisiana State University
Loyola University
Marquette University
Maryland, University of
McGill University
Montreal, University of
Nebraska, University of
New York University
North Carolina, University of
North Dakota, University of
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
Oklahoma, University of
Oregon, University of
Pittsburgh, University of
Princeton University
St. Louis University
South Carolina, University of
Southern California, University of
Stanford University
Texas, University of
Vanderbilt University
Virginia, University of
Washington, University of
Washington University
West Virginia University
Western Reserve University
Wisconsin, University of
Yale University

The following institutions have no copies of unpublished Ph. D. theses in history available for circulation, though some of them have one copy in their library which may be consulted there:

Catholic University of America
Columbia University
Harvard University
Kentucky, University of
Laval University
Michigan, University of
Minnesota, University of
Pennsylvania, University of
Radcliffe College
Toronto, University of

The following require that the Ph. D. thesis shall be printed before the degree is conferred. Laval University gives the candidate the option of filing fifty mimeographed copies of the thesis.

Catholic University of America
Columbia University
Laval University
Loyola University

The following institutions do not require that the Ph. D. thesis be printed or multiplied by any other process:

Boston University
California, University of
Clark University
Colorado, University of
Fordham University
George Washington University
Harvard University
Marquette University
McGill University
Montreal, University of
North Dakota, University of
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
Oregon, University of
Pittsburgh, University of
Radcliffe College
South Carolina, University of
Stanford University
Washington, University of
West Virginia University
Western Reserve University

It will be noted that Harvard University and Radcliffe College are the only institutions of higher learning to which this inquiry has been directed which neither provide a duplicate copy of the unpublished thesis nor provide for publication. It should, however, be pointed out that Harvard University and Radcliffe College print periodically abstracts of theses. The University of Kentucky, the University of Minnesota, and the University of Pennsylvania provide no duplicate copy of the unpublished thesis. They have a publication requirement, but it appears that this requirement, at least in two of these institutions, is not applied rigidly enough to insure that the Ph. D. thesis shall be published within a reasonable time after the degree is conferred. It, therefore, not infrequently happens that several years elapse between the time when Ph. D. theses in these institutions are accepted and the time when they are made accessible to scholars.

The requirements for printing theses after the degree is conferred seem to be administered with a great deal of latitude. In some cases a bond is exacted that the thesis shall be published within a certain number of years, but in more than one case this bond is for so small a sum (as low as $50 in one large midwestern university) that it constitutes little more than a small fine. In other cases no bond is exacted at all, and many instances could be cited in which the thesis has remained unpublished for as long as ten years after the degree has been conferred. The difficulty, of course, is largely a financial one, and there are indications that during the current depression the publication requirement has very often been ignored. In a good many cases the publication requirement is in practice interpreted to mean that no more than the significant part of the thesis need be published, and is held to be satisfied by an article or articles in a learned review.

The following institutions require that the Ph. D. thesis in history shall be printed in full at some time after the degree is conferred:

Kentucky, University of
Louisiana State University
Michigan, University of
Nebraska, University of
New York University
Pennsylvania, University of
Toronto, University of
Washington University
Wisconsin, University of
Yale University

The following institutions require the printing of the Ph. D. thesis in history either in full or in some condensed form sometime after the degree is conferred:

Brown University
Bryn Mawr College
Chicago, University of
Cornell University
Duke University
Illinois, University of
Indiana University
Iowa, University of
Johns Hopkins University
Kansas, University of
Kentucky, University of
Marquette University
Maryland, University of
Minnesota, University of
North Carolina, University of
Oklahoma, University of
Princeton University
St. Louis University
Southern California, University of
Texas, University of
Vanderbilt University
Virginia, University of

The following institutions publish periodically collected abstracts of Ph. D. theses in history:

Clark University
Colorado, University of
George Washington University
Harvard University
Iowa, University of
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
Oklahoma, University of
Pittsburgh, University of
Princeton University
South Carolina, University of
Stanford University
Vanderbilt University
Virginia, University of
Western Reserve University

It should be understood that this classification represents present practice and in many cases incorporates changes which have been made very recently. There has, for example, been a marked increase within the last few years in the number of institutions making available a copy of unpublished Ph. D. theses for circulation. It is gratifying to be able to add that five American universities have established this arrangement within the past few weeks in response to the recommendation of the American Historical Association.*

CONYERS READ, *Executive Secretary.*

The American Historical Association plans to publish periodically a list of research and editorial projects being actively carried forward in the field of history. Such a list will serve to prevent wasteful duplication of effort and

*This report is based upon information received directly from the dean or some other officer in the graduate school of the institutions included. Before being sent to press it has been submitted for correction to the officials who supplied the original information.

should facilitate contacts between scholars working in allied fields. To enable him to compile the list Dr. Read, the Executive Secretary, has recently sent to heads of university departments of history and directors of learned foundations the following questions:

1. What research projects and what editorial projects in history have you in preparation?
2. Is this project merely in contemplation, or is it actually under way?
3. How soon (approximately) do you expect to finish it?
4. How big (approximately) in terms of printed pages do you expect it to be when completed?

Dr. Read further said that the canvass is not intended to include the work of graduate students being done to satisfy the requirements for the M. A. or the Ph. D. degree. He asked that the definition of the research subjects be as precise as possible, in order not to prevent other scholars from entering a field in which the reporter means to cultivate only a small corner. It is important also to remember that the dream of doing research work in a selected field does not establish a prior claim. This is not to be regarded as an opportunity to align one's self with productive scholars without any real claim to the position.

All reports on the subject should be sent to the Executive Secretary at his office, 226 South 16th Street, Philadelphia.

The committee on the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund has sanctioned the following additional undertakings: Mr. Frank Monaghan to edit newly discovered papers of John Jay, in two volumes; Professor W. C. Binkley to edit the correspondence of the interim government of the Republic of Texas, 1836; Mr. Howard C. Perkins to edit a selection of Northern editorials on approaching war, 1861. Professor U. B. Phillips, with health fully restored, has resumed active chairmanship of the committee.

The Independent Offices Appropriation bill, passed by the Congress on June 15, omitted, along with the customary provisions for printing for the Smithsonian Institution, the usual appropriation for the printing of the *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association. This involves postponement, at least, of *Writings on American History* for 1931 and 1932 and of Professor Bemis's and Miss Griffin's elaborate *Guide for the Study of American Diplomatic History*. The volume of proceedings for 1932 and that containing the *Diary of Edward Bates* may, however, be expected to be issued, from the appropriations for the fiscal year just ended.

The mailing list for the October number of the *American Historical Review* will go to press by September 15. A new address list of the members of the Association will be distributed to all members whose dues are not in arrears with the October number. Any changes of address should be sent

before July 15 to the office of the Association at 40 B Street, S. W., Washington, D. C.

Mr. Tracy McGregor, of Washington, has accepted an *ad interim* appointment to the Board of Trustees of the Association, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. Fairfax Harrison.

A friend of history having formed a project for supplying a selected group of college libraries with a certain number of Americana of the rarer sort, a small committee (J. F. Jameson, chairman) has been appointed by the American Historical Association to assist in the execution of the plan.

On March 31 Miss Eleanor D. Smith, formerly instructor in history in Goucher College, more recently at the University of Chicago completing the requirements for the doctor's degree, began work as editorial assistant in the office of this journal.

PERSONAL

Walter Wybergh How, the English classicist and historian, died on December 3 at the age of 71. He was tutor in Merton College, Oxford, from 1897 to 1930. Besides works in the classical field, he was author of a *History of Rome* (with H. D. Leigh, in 1896) and of *Hannibal and the Great War between Rome and Carthage* (1899).

Augustus F. Moulton, state historian of Maine, died on March 16 at the age of 84. Among his published works were *Old Prouts Neck* (1924), *Portland by the Sea* (1926), and *Maine Historical Sketches* (1929).

William Glover Stanard, corresponding secretary and librarian of the Virginia Historical Society since 1898, died on May 6.

The account which Dr. Max Farrand has given in the February *Huntington Library Bulletin* of Frederick Jackson Turner at the Huntington Library fills out the picture of a great career, the significance of which has so often been the subject of reflection and comment in the few months since Turner's death. In this account interest centers naturally upon the pathetic struggle to finish a task, to reach a goal long years in mind before failing strength should make further effort impossible. The article has also been issued separately, with an interesting photograph of Turner as a frontispiece.

The fellowships within the historical field, awarded by the American Council of Learned Societies, with the project upon which the incumbent is engaged, are: Jacques Barzun, Columbia University, the influence of race consciousness and race theories on French thought and culture; C. H. Peake, Columbia University, the history of Chinese law and its administration during the Ch'ing Dynasty, 1644–1911; D. V. Thompson, jr., Yale University, the medieval technique of manuscript illumination, based principally on the short medieval Latin text "De Coloribus et Mixtionibus". The grants-in-aid

are: M. L. W. Laistner, Cornell University, an edition of Bede's Commentary on Acts; J. A. O. Larsen, University of Chicago, the social and economic conditions of Roman Gaul; Dorothy L. Mackay, Duke University, studies in the history of the University of Orleans; W. T. Morgan, Indiana University, a bibliographical guide to British history, 1700–1715; G. E. Mylonas, University of Illinois, the excavation of Haghios Kosmas; J. C. Russell, University of North Carolina, bibliographical studies in thirteenth century England.

One of the fellowships awarded by the Social Science Research Council lies specifically within the historical field: P. W. Gates, Bucknell University, a study of the operation of the Federal land system. The grants-in-aid are: H. F. Barker, U. S. Tariff Commission, the completion of a study of the status of British, German, and French nomenclatures in the seventeenth century; Viola F. Barnes, Mount Holyoke College, the disaster of British expansion, 1760 to 1778; W. C. Binkley, Vanderbilt University, a history of the Republic of Texas; L. M. Case, The Rice Institute, French public opinion concerning the Roman Question, 1849 to 1870, and the United States Civil War, 1861 to 1865; E. M. Coulter, University of Georgia, the planter civilization of coastal Georgia; L. C. Helderman, Washington and Lee University, George Tucker as a social scientist of the Old South; Susan M. Kingsbury, Bryn Mawr College, the editing of the records of the Virginia Company of London; A. R. M. Lower, Wesley College, the Canadian timber trade in the nineteenth century; H. S. Lucas, University of Washington, the purchase of a photostatic copy of a wardrobe account of Edward I. of England; Frank Monaghan, New York University, the editing of the diaries and the unpublished correspondence of John Jay; R. B. Morris, College of the City of New York, the influence of the legal development of important commercial centers in England and the Continent—notably London—upon the growth of the law merchant in the American colonies in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; C. P. Nettels, University of Wisconsin, the money supply of the American colonies before 1720; C. W. New, McMaster University, a biography of Lord Brougham; F. W. Pitman, Pomona College, the transition of Jamaica from slavery to freedom, 1833 to 1866; C. C. Tansill, American University, the diplomatic relations of the United States and Santo Domingo, 1798 to 1909; A. P. Watts, University of Pennsylvania, the West Indies during the period of the American Revolution; Mary W. Williams, Goucher College, a biography of Pedro II., Emperor of Brazil.

In March the Guggenheim Foundation announced the fellowships and grants for the coming year. Those of interest in the field of history were awarded to the following persons, with the accompanying projects: L. J. Ragatz, George Washington University, the social and economic structure

of the French Antilles during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; Kenneth Scott, Western Reserve University, the religious and political history of the Roman Empire.

Dr. Charles O. Paullin, of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, has received, as author, jointly with Dr. J. K. Wright, of the American Geographical Society, as editor, the Loubat Prize of $1000 for the *Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States.* This prize is presented every five years for the "best work in the English language on the history, geography, ethnology, philology, or numismatics of North America". The second prize of $400 was awarded to Professor Walter P. Webb, of the University of Texas, for his volume on *The Great Plains.*

The Pulitzer Prize for History has been awarded posthumously to the late Frederick Jackson Turner for his volume of essays entitled *The Significance of Sections in American History,* which is reviewed in this journal. The Pulitzer Prize for Biography has been awarded to Allan Nevins for his *Grover Cleveland.*

Professor Bernard Faÿ, of the Collège de France, delivered six lectures in May at Northwestern University on the Norman Wait Harris Foundation. His subject was Radicalism in America, 1770–1800.

The Anson G. Phelps Lectures on Early American History at New York University were delivered this year in April and May by Professor Charles M. Andrews, of Yale University. The subject for the six lectures was Our Earliest Colonial Settlements: their Diversities of Origin and Later Characteristics.

Professor William Leonard Langer will be Harvard Lecturer in History at Yale University for the first semester, 1933–1934.

Professor Walter Phelps Hall, professor of history at Princeton University, has been made Dodge Professor of History.

At the University of Chicago Professor William E. Dodd has resigned the chairmanship of the department but will continue as professor. Professor Bernadotte E. Schmitt has been appointed to the chairmanship. Professor Raymond C. Miller of the College of the City of Detroit has been appointed to conduct Professor A. O. Craven's courses during the autumn quarter, 1933.

Professor A. O. Craven, of the University of Chicago, will be a research associate at the Huntington Library, San Marino, during the coming academic year. Three "International Research Fellowships" have been granted: to Dr. Sanford B. Larkey, of the University of California; Dr. W. Lee Ustick, recently of Goucher College, and Dr. Francis R. Johnson.

Two of the historical fraternity have been chosen by President Roosevelt for important diplomatic posts: Professor W. E. Dodd, of the University of Chicago, as ambassador to Germany, and Professor R. G. Caldwell, of Rice Institute, as ambassador to Portugal.

The following promotions may be noted: *Harvard University,* Michael Karpovich to be assistant professor; *Princeton University,* Elmer A. Beller and John E. Pomfret to be associate professors, Chester W. Clark to be assistant professor; *Yale University,* Kan-Ichi Asakawa to be research associate, Gilbert Norman Tucker to be assistant professor.

Leaves of absence for the year 1933–1934 have been granted as follows: *Columbia University,* for the second semester John A. Krout, Allan Nevins, William L. Westermann; *Cornell University,* J. P. Bretz for the first semester; *Harvard University,* Arthur M. Schlesinger for the year; *Indiana University,* John C. Andressohn for the first semester; *Princeton University,* Elmer A. Beller, appointed Benjamin D. Shreve Fellow, for the year; *Smith College,* Jean Wilson and Leona Gabel, for the year; *University of Michigan,* A. L. Dunham for the year; *Vassar College,* Louise Fargo Brown for the year.

Professor Reginald C. McGrane will shortly publish a work dealing with the whole question of state debts which were in default or were repudiated either before or after the Civil War.

GENERAL

Dr. Charles A. Beard's reply to the toast given at Toronto to "The Association" is printed in the *Canadian Historical Review* for March.[1] It is followed by Professor George M. Wrong's paper on The Historian's Duty to Society, read at one of the sessions. They appear under the title of The Historian and Society.

The presidential address at the annual meeting of the British Historical Association at Torquay in January, delivered by the Rt. Rev. J. H. B. Masterman, had as its theme the Teaching of Local History. It is published in *History* for April.

The Inaugural Lecture of Mr. Jerome D. Greene, as Wilson Professor of International Politics at the University College of Wales, on February 1, had as its subject Idealism and Realism in Efforts toward Peace. Professor Greene recognized the existence of the difficulties which have faced such schemes of international coöperation as the League of Nations, but believed that these might be overcome if man were as adventurous and determined in dealing

[1] Articles mentioned in this and the following sections have appeared since July, 1932. Books mentioned were published in 1932, unless another date is given.

with them as he is in harnessing nature to his purposes. He at the same time deprecated the species of zeal on the part of the defenders of the League which would have it "descend, horse, foot and dragoons, on a Power which resents and opposes the League's intervention, regardless of the fact that what would then ensue might be nothing less than war". Incidentally he made a graceful allusion to his predecessor, Professor Charles K. Webster, now of the University of London.

Professor Paul Harsin, of the University of Liége, has published a volume entitled *Comment on Écrit l'Histoire* (Paris, Droz, 1933, pp. 152, 15 fr.) which deals with the problems of history on lines similar to the discussions in the well-known book of Langlois and Seignobos.

The *Bulletin* of the International Committee of Historical Sciences for February is devoted to the Seventh International Congress of Historical Sciences which is to meet in August in Warsaw. It embodies fifteen reports already submitted. Among them is a paper by Professor E. M. Wilbur, of the Pacific Unitarian School for the Ministry, on Faustus Socinus: an Estimate of his Life and Influence.

An important work on the general history of the Church is *Geschichte der Alten Kirche,* by Hans Lietzmann (Berlin, De Gruyter, pp. 323, 7 M.).

My American Lectures, by Professor Nicolas Jorga, rector of the Bucharest University, collected and arranged by Norman L. Forter (Bucharest, State Printing Office, pp. 192), are based upon the addresses given at the various Roumanian centers in the United States and before university and scientific audiences. They show decided variety, though all deal with Southeastern Europe. They embody deductions on several important subjects, chiefly, of course, Roumanian: Byzantine and Roumanian art, Roumanian origins, French influence, the Churches and religious organizations in Southeastern Europe, Roumanian historians, and democracy in Southeastern Europe. Unhappily there are many faults of translation, the English being frequently heavy, spotted with non-English words, spelling incorrect, and the volume is destitute of bibliography or index. One might question the absoluteness of Rousseau's domination in America at any time (p. 159), one might criticize Dr. Jorga's assumptions as to the origin of American towns (p. 110), one might take other exceptions, yet these lectures do give the matured conclusions of the most prominent and surely one of the greatest historical scholars of Southeastern Europe at the present time. A. I. A.

Articles: Wallace Notestein, *History and the Biographer* (Yale Rev., spring); Edward Maslin Hulme, *The Personal Equation in History* (Pacific Hist. Rev., Mar.); A. S. Turberville, *History, Objective and Subjective* (History, Jan.); J. L. Myres, *Dr. Hermann Schneider's Philosphy of History*

(*ibid.*); Helmut Klocke, *Besinnung der Geschichtswissenschaft in Ungarn* (Arch. für Kulturgesch., XXIII. 3); Georg Steinhausen, *Geschichte der Gesellschaftlichen Kultur und Sittengeschichte* (*ibid.*); Van Schelven, *La Notion Politique de la Tolérance Religieuse* (Rev. Hist., Mar.); R. H. Tawney, *The Study of Economic History* (Economica, Feb.); Moritz J. Elsas, *Zur Methode der Preisgeschichte* (Zeitsch. für die Gesamte Staatswiss., XCIV. 2); Emanuel Hugo Vogel, *Die Objektivistischen, Statisch-Deduktiven Preistheorien* (*ibid.*); Paul Harsin, *Le Salaire, d'après M. François Simiand* [*Salaire, l'Évolution Sociale et la Monnaie* (Alcan, 3 vols.)] (Rev. d'Hist. Mod., Nov.); R. Villate, *Institutions Militaires* (Rev. de Synthèse, Feb.).

ANCIENT HISTORY

General review: Ch. Guignebert, *Histoire des Religions, Judaïsme et Christianisme Antique* (Rev. Hist., Mar.).

A Chronique Égyptologique by P. Montet appears in the *Revue des Études Anciennes* for March.

The Jahrbuch of the German Archæological Institute (1932, 1–2), publishes a summary of the results of recent excavations. An account of the excavations at Ur by C. L. Woolley appears in the *Museum Journal* (XXIII. 3); also an article by E. A. Speiser on the pottery of Tell Billa. Reports of excavations in Egypt at Oxyrhyncus, Nubia, Touna, Memphis, and Aniba are published in vol. XXXII. of the *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte*. One may note also N. Glueck's survey of Palestinian and Syrian archæology in the *American Journal of Archaeology* for March, R. Mallon's description of the results of excavations at Teleilat Ghassat in *Syria* (XIII. 4), and Garstang's article on Jericho city and necropolis during the early and middle bronze age in the *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* (XIX. 3–4). The same journal also contains a report of the British Museum excavations at Nineveh (1930–1931), by R. C. Thompson and R. W. Hamilton. E. P. Blegen's News Items from Athens reviews recent discoveries in Greece for the *American Journal of Archaeology* (March), and material on new finds at Nemi and at Ostia appears in the *Notizie degli Scavi* (sixth series, VIII. 4–6).

Medinet Habu: Ausgrabungen des Oriental Institutes der Universität Chicago, by Uvo Hölscher, has been published as Heft 24 of *Morgenland*. It is a preliminary report of excavations carried on at Medinet Habu in recent years. The text includes a short account of previous work on the site, and a description, with drawings in the text and twenty-nine plates, of the temple of Rameses III., of the buildings of the 18th dynasty, and in a third section, of buildings after the death of Rameses III.

Professor J. F. Dobson's *Ancient Education and its Meaning to Us* (Longmans, pp. vii, 234, $1.75) should prove a happy medium between individual volumes on Greek, Roman, and early Christian education and the brief and too often out-of-date summaries in histories of education. It contains no novelties, but is clear and adequate, with a proper attention to the relationship between ancient education and ancient life in general, and a differentiation of the distinct periods in both, which are too often ignored by non-classical pedagogues. A work in a kindred field is *Ancient Writing and its Influence* (University of Chicago Press, pp. 205, $1.75), by Professor B. L. Ullman. The author's researches in the history of the alphabet, as well as his wide knowledge of paleography and the general transmission of classical texts and scholarship have led to a liberal interpretation of "Ancient Writing". His book offers the intelligent and inquiring mind much useful information on the character and influence of writing from its first invention to the latest classicisms of the advertisers. For amateur paleographers seeking understanding of medieval manuscripts it is a *vade mecum* rich in detail, from which the seasoned paleographer will not hesitate to draw. E. M. S.

An article of special importance by Rhys Carpenter entitled The Antiquity of the Greek Alphabet appeared in the *American Journal of Archaeology* for March. The author believes that the Greeks did not begin to use the Phœnician alphabet before the middle of the 8th century B. C.

Xénophon Historien, by G. Colin (*Annales de l'Est,* 1933, Mémoires, no. 2) is a detailed study of Xenophon's *Hellenica,* Book II., with the purpose of evaluating it as a historical source for the period which it covers. The author discovers evidence in Xenophon of omission of pertinent facts owing to lack of interest in them, owing to partizanship, and to a failure to realize which facts were important, also of some rearrangement in the interests of dramatic and rhetorical form. He concludes that Xenophon while remaining an important source for the period is worthy of much less confidence than has been given him. The monograph closes with a month-by-month calendar of events from 406/5 to 401/0 B. C.

Professor Rostovtzeff's *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* has just been published in an Italian translation by G. Sanna and with a preface by G. de Sanctis (Florence, La Nuova Italia). This is practically a third edition of the work. The text has been altered in a few places, and additions have been made by the author to the notes, bibliography, and illustrations.

Vol. II. of *Antoninus Pius* by Willy Hüttl (Prague, 1933), consists of a collection of sources for the discussion contained in vol. I., which has not yet been published. The first part of volume II. collects the evidence regarding the officials, both senatorial and imperial, of Rome and the provinces dur-

ing the principate of Antoninus Pius; the second part which is entitled Antoninus Pius in the inscriptions of his time, gathers together from many scattered sources the Greek and Latin inscriptions which can be dated to the time of this emperor. The whole forms a necessary basis for the study of this emperor and seems to be quite complete.

Articles: N. D. Mironov, *Aryan Vestiges in the Near East in the Second Millenium B. C.* (Acta Orient., XI. 1); F. W. König, *Geschichte Elams* (Der Alte Orient, XXXIX. 4); P. Koschaker, *Fratriarchat, Hausgemeinschaft und Mutterrecht in Keilschriftrechten* (Zeitsch. für Assyriologie, Feb.); J. Kaufman, *Probleme der Israelitisch-Jüdischen Religionsgeschichte* (Zeitsch. für die Alttest. Wissensch., N. F., X. 1); M. A. Levi, *La Spedizione Scitica di Darjo* (Riv. di Filol., Mar.); F. Bilabel, *The Early History of the Greek People and the Indogermanic Migrations during the Second Millenium B. C.* (Class. Weekly, Mar. 27 and Apr. 3); G. de Sanctis, *Intorno al Razionalismo di Ecateo* (Riv. di Filol., Mar.); W. S. Ferguson and W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Last Inventory of the Pronaos of the Parthenon* (Amer. Jour. Arch., Mar.); E. Silberschlag, *The Earliest Record of the Jews in Asia Minor* (Jour. Bibl. Lit., Apr.); André Piganiol, *Un Document d'Histoire Sociale Romaine: la Classification Servienne* (An. d'Hist. Éc. et Soc., Mar.); T. Frank, *An Interpretation of Cato, Agricultura 136* (Amer. Jour. Philol., Apr.); R. M. Haywood, *Some Traces of Serfdom in Cicero's Day* (*ibid.*); M. Reinhold, *The Perusine War* (Class. Weekly, Apr. 24); L. R. Taylor, *Quirinius and the Census of Judaea* (Amer. Jour. Phil., Apr.); E. Höhl, *Wenn hat Tiberius das Principat Uebernommen?* (Hermes, LXVIII. 1); J. Vogt, *Vorläufer des Optimus Princeps* (*ibid.*); M. Rostovtzeff, *Hadad and Atargatis at Palmyra* (Amer. Jour. Arch., Mar.); L. de Regibus, *Il Computo della 'Trib. Pot.' per la Cronologia degli Imperatori Valeriano e Galliano* (Historia, VI. 4); Jean Gagé, *La Théologie de la Victoire Impériale* (Rev. Hist., Jan.); Hans Erich Stier, *Zur Varusschlacht* (Hist. Zeitsch., Feb. 28); E. v. Dobschütz, *Der Historiker und das Neue Testament* (Zeitsch. für die Neutest. Wissensch., XXXII. 1). T. R. S. B.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

General review: Louis Halphen, *Le Moyen Age jusqu'aux Valois* [I.] (Rev. Hist., Jan.); Francesco Foberti, *Nuovi Studi su Gioacchino da Fiore* (N. Riv. Stor., Nov.).

A work of the first importance for the history of the organization of the Church, as well as for the development of the canon law is *Histoire des Collections Canoniques en Occident depuis les Fausses Décrétales jusqu'au Décret de Gratien* (Paris, Sirey, 1931, 1932, 2 vols., pp. xvi, 463, 386, 220 fr.), by Paul Fournier, with the collaboration of Gabriel Le Bras. It belongs to

the series entitled Bibliothèque d'Histoire du Droit, which is carried forward under the auspices of the Société d'Histoire du Droit. A preliminary chapter in volume I., written by M. Le Bras, sketches the history of canonical collections in the West prior to the False Decretals. Although the work stops at the point where the work of Gratian opens, M. Le Bras announces a comprehensive study of Gratian which is soon to follow. This work is the subject of extended comment by Professor F. M. Powicke in *History* for April.

Isis for April contains the Thirty-Fifth Critical Bibliography of the History and Philosophy of Science and of the History of Civilization. The list is complete to August, 1932, and contains some 350 items, contributed by eighteen collaborators.

Digests of the many papers read during the Journées d'Histoire du Droit held at Paris in June 1932 are published in the January-March issue of the *Revue Historique de Droit Français et Étranger*. Most of these papers were concerned with medieval subjects.

The *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* for April contains a classified bibliography of 143 pages, including over 2700 items. In addition there are a number of noteworthy reviews and the following articles of significance: L. Gougaud, Sur les Routes de Rome et sur le Rhin avec les 'Peregrini' Insulaires; L. de Lagger, L'Albigeois pendant la Crise de l'Albigéisme, l'Episcopat de Guilhem Peire (1185–1227); G. Mollat, A propos du Droit de Dépouille; A. De Poorter, Catalogue des Livres d'Heures et de Prières de la Bibliothèque de Bruges; P. Lefèvre, Le Séjour du Mystique Brabançon Jean de Ruusbrooc à Bruxelles.

Professor Fritz Rörig's *Mittelalterliche Weltwirtschaft: Blüte und Ende einer Weltwirtschaftsperiode* is published as no. 40 of Bernhard Harms's Kieler Vorträge (Jena, Verlag von Gustav Fischer, 1933).

M. Postan, in the *Economic History Review* for April, writes a critical survey of the materials available for the study of medieval capitalism. This essay contains a useful bibliography in the footnotes.

The April number of the *Revue du Cercle des Alumni de la Fondation Universitaire* (Brussels) contains several essays of interest to historians. P. A. Belvaux, Professeur à l'École des Hautes Études de Gand, writes an appreciative survey of the life and work of Dom Ursmer Berlière (1861–1932). An excellent portrait of the learned Benedictine accompanies this article. Félix Peeters gives some interesting notes concerning the École Française de Rome, and Fernand Vercauteren contributes a scholarly evaluation of Professeur Adolph Dopsch et l'École Historique de Vienne.

The *Annales d'Histoire Économique et Sociale* for January contains Le Problème de l'Or au Moyen Age, an important essay contributed by Marc

Bloch. There is appended to this article a short, but very useful survey of the pertinent bibliography.

Miss Helen Elizabeth Muhfeld has edited a medieval survey, written in Latin, of the manor of Wye, belonging to Battle Abbey, furnishing the text with a substantial introduction. The title of the volume is *A Survey of the Manor of Wye* (Columbia University Press, 1933, pp. lxxvii, 256, $4.00), and it belongs to the series of Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law.

The October-December *Bulletin* of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Comptes Rendus des Séances de l'Année 1932 contains an appreciative survey of the life and writings of the late Maurice Prou. This article is contributed by René Cagnat.

Articles: Lynn Thorndike, *Notes on Some Latin Manuscripts at Wolfenbüttel* (Speculum, Apr.); J. N. C. Clark, *The Annotations of Ekkehart IV. in the Orosius MS., St. Gall 621* (Bull. Du Cange, 1932, 1); B. Krusch, *Die Handschriftlichen Grundlagen der Historia Francorum Gregors von Tours* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Apr.); Emil Göller, *Papsttum und Bussgewalt in Spätrömischer und Frühmittelalterlicher Zeit* (Röm. Quartalsch., XL. 3–4); J. Rivière, *Les 'Capitula' d'Abélard condamnés au Concile de Sens* (Recherches de Théologie Anc. et Méd., Jan.); Percy Ernst Schramm, *"Vom Heiligen Geist des Mittelalters"* [apropos of a volume by Wolfram von den Steinen] (Hist. Zeitsch., Feb. 28); E. Chabanier, *Un Cosmographe du* XII^e^ *Siècle Capable de Mesures Exactes de Longitudes* (Acad. des Inscript. et Belles-Lettres, Bull., Oct.); K. Pivec, *Studien und Forschungen zur Ausgabe des Codex Uldarici* [II.]: *Der Codex Uldarici und die Kanzlei Heinrichs V.* (Mitteil. des Oesterr. Inst. für Geschichtsf., XLVI. 3–4); W. Ohnsorge, *"Kaiser" Konrad III., Zur Geschichte des Staufischen Staatsgedankens* (*ibid.*); Benno Hilliger, *Die Reichssteuerliste von 1242* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Apr.); S. H. Thomson, *The Text of Grosseteste's De Cometis* (Isis, Apr.); D. C. Munro and C. D. Haagensen, *Arabian Medicine as represented in the Memoirs of Usamah Ibn Munqidh* (An. of Med. Hist., May); J. S. Beddie, *Books in the East during the Crusades* (Speculum, Apr.); S. Painter, *To Whom were dedicated the 'Fables' of Marie de France?* (Mod. Lang. Notes, June); André E. Sayous, *L'Origine de la Lettre de Change: les Procédés de Crédit et de Paiement dans les Pays Chrétiens de la Méditerranée Occidentale entre le Milieu du XII^e^ Siècle et celui du XIII^e^* (Rev. Hist. de Droit Franç. et Étrang., Jan.); P. M. Baumgarten, *Zum Päpstlichen Urkundenwesen des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts* (Röm. Quartalsch., XL. 3–4); J. Huizinga, *Burgund, eine Krise des Romanisch-Germanischen Verhältnisses* (Hist. Zeitsch., Apr. 22); Henri Laurent, *Crise Monétaire et Difficultés Économiques en Flandre, aux XIV^e^ et XV^e^ Siècles* (An. d'Hist. Éc. et Soc., Mar.); E. F. Meyer, *Some Aspects of "Withernam"* (Speculum, Apr.); H. S. Lucas, *The*

Sources and Literature on Jacob Van Artevelde (*ibid.*); A. Schulte, *Pavia und Regensburg* (Hist. Jahrb., LII. 4); H. Jecht, *Der Wirtschaftsstil des Spätmittelalters* (Vierteljahr. für Sozial und Wirtschaftsgesch., XXVI. 1); H. Nelis, *Origine de l'Appellation: 'Philippe le Bon'* [Duke of Burgundy] (Rev. Belge de Philol. et d'Hist., Jan.); H. P. Lattin, *The Origin of our Present System of Notation according to the Theories of Nicholas Bubnoy* (Isis, Apr.); Hans Genzsch, *Die Anlage des Aeltesten Sammlung von Briefen Enea Silvio Piccolominis, mit 16 Bildtafeln* (Mitteil. des Oesterr. Inst. für Geschichtsf., XLVI. 3–4); F. Dölger, *Die Frage der Judensteuer in Byzanz* (Vierteljahr. für Sozial und Wirtschaftsgesch., XXVI. 1); Edmund W. Pavenstedt, *Mediaeval Carpet-Baggers* (South Atlantic Quar., Apr.).

G. C. B.

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

General review: Louis Hautecoeur, *Histoire de l'Art du XV^e^ Siècle à nos Jours* (Rev. Hist., Mar.); Albert Depréaux, *et al., Ouvrages relatifs à l'Histoire Coloniale* (Rev. d'Hist. Mod., Nov.).

In *L'Art Religieux après le Concile de Trente: Étude sur l'Iconographie de la Fin du XVI^e^, du XVII^e^, du XVIII^e^ Siècle; Italie, France, Espagne, Flandres,* É. Mâle presents the fourth and last volume of his great survey of religious art during the medieval and modern period (Paris, Colin, pp. v, 532, 160 fr.).

No. XVI. of the Harvard Theological Studies is a translation of *The Two Treatises of Servetus on the Trinity* (Harvard University Press, pp. xxxviii, 264). The translator is Dr. Earl Morse Wilbur, who has contributed an introduction, a short life of Servetus, and a bibliography of the subject selected from the writer's catalogue of more than 600 titles dealing with Servetus.

A useful history of the chief schools of economic thought and policy is *Die Wandlungen der Wirtschaft im Kapitalistischen Zeitalter: ein Sammelwerk der Internationalen Vereinigung für Rechts- und Wirtschaftsphilosophie,* edited by Goetz Briefs with the collaboration of W. Andreas, E. Berger, T. Brauer, W. F. Bruck, F. Darmstaedter, S. Helander, O. v. Mering, A. Meusel, K. Ritter, W. Röpke, G. A. Salander, and G. Wünsch (Berlin, Rothschild, pp. v, 456, 16 M.).

Europe in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, 1789–1932 (Longmans, Green, pp. x, 652, $3.75), by A. J. Grant, M. A., formerly professor of history in the University of Leeds, and Harold Temperley, Litt. D., professor of Modern history in the University of Cambridge, is the fourth edition of *Europe in the Nineteenth Century,* published first in 1927. Chs. XXV.–XXVIII., on the period immediately preceding the World War, have been

revised in view of the most recent publications. For the opinions expressed here Professor Grant holds himself responsible, in view of the fact that Professor Temperley is one of the editors of the *British Documents on the Origins of the War*. Professor Temperley's principal contribution is the account of the years since the outbreak of the war, chs. XXIX.-XXXV. The chapter on the World War is remarkable for clarifying selection, with vivid descriptive strokes of personal characterization. Similar qualities appear in the chapter on the Paris Conference and the Treaty with Germany, 1919. Lloyd George's share in the negotiations is treated more sympathetically than is usually done. Wilson, while a "magnificent orator", "had no legal precision of mind, and no sort of readiness in debate". The portrait of Clemenceau is skillfully drawn.

A translation of the account of the Commune of 1871 by Karl Marx has now appeared under the title of *The Civil War in France, with an Introduction by Frederick Engels* (New York, International Publishers, 1933, pp. 92).

The sixth volume of Josef Šusta's *Svetova Politika* (in Czech) covering the period 1871–1914 has recently been published by Vesmir (Prague). Its central chapters include Germany and England 1909–1911, the Agadir incident, the Haldane mission, the Tripolitan War, Balkan developments and conditions, the Balkan War up to the London Conference, European complications, the Second Balkan War, Events outside Europe (Far East, Colonial Empires, America), the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente, the Austro-German interference in Balkan politics, and Sarajevo. It is accompanied by a thorough bibliography and adequate index but no maps. A. I. A.

The brief summary of the World War made in *Petite Histoire de la Grande Guerre* (Paris, Rieder, pp. 122, 15 fr.), by J. M. Bourget, will prove very useful to those who have some previous knowledge of the conflict but need refreshing of the memory. It assumes just enough background to impair somewhat its value for those who do not possess such knowledge. The attention of the author is devoted almost exclusively to military events, except for a brief final chapter which seeks to summarize the more significant non-military elements of the struggle. Some of the maps suffer from an attempt to depict too many operations on one map. T. S. A.

Vol. III. of tome I. of the French official history of the World War is entitled *La Bataille de la Marne*, and covers the days from Sept. 6 to Sept. 14, 1914. There are four volumes of annexes and two sets of maps (Paris, L'Imprimerie Nationale, 1933, 920 fr.).

The Stanford University Press has established a new series of Hoover War Library Publications. The volumes on *The Fall of the German Empire*, by Professor Ralph H. Lutz will become nos. 1 and 2 of this series. The series

listing on the cloth cover and title-page has been changed accordingly in the publisher's stock. The new binding and title-page will be substituted for any purchasers of the volumes who will return them to Stanford University Press, Stanford University, California, for that purpose. There is no charge for this, and shipping charges both ways will be paid by the publishers, who ask that the books be returned by book express, collect.

Articles: Hedwig Hintze, *Nation et Humanité dans la Pensée des Temps Modernes* (Rev. d'Hist. Mod., Jan.); André Allix, *L'Évolution Rurale des Alpes* (An. d'Hist. Éc. et Soc., Mar.); E. Rodocanachi, *L'Entrevue de Clément VII. et de François Ier à Marseille* (N. Rev., Mar. 15); Waldemar Westergaard, *Gustavus Vasa and Russia, 1555–1557* (Pacific Hist. Rev., Mar.); Francis J. Bowman, *The European Naval Situation during the Early Years of the Thirty Years' War* (*ibid.*); Wilhelm Böhm, *Die Schlachtordnung der Kaiserlichen bei Lützen, 6./16. November 1632* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Apr.); Richard Lodge, *The Methuen Treaties of 1703* [Historical Revision, LXV.] (History, Apr.); Eugen Tarlé, *Russland und die Kontinentalsperre* (Zeitsch. für die Gesamte Staatswiss., Feb.); Arthur Dunham, *Michel Chevalier et le Traité de 1860* (Rev. Hist., Jan.); Francis Greenwood Peabody, *An Episode in International Philanthropy* [relief sent to France, in 1871] (New Eng. Quar., Mar.); E. C. Helmreich, *Russlands Einfluss auf den Balkanbund im Oktober 1912* (Berl. Monatsh., Mar.); Paul Herre, *Die Kleinen Staaten und die Entstehung des Weltkrieges* [III., IV., V.] (*ibid.*, Mar., Apr., May); Arrigo Solmi, *L'Intervento Italiano e le sue Conseguenze Politiche, Maggio-Agosto, 1915* (N. Antol., Apr. 16).

Documents: Fernand Vercauteren, ed., *Note sur les Opérations Financières de Charles-Quint dans les Pays-Bas, en 1523* [texts of two orders of Charles] (Rev. Hist., Jan.); E. C. Helmreich, ed., *An Unpublished Report on Austro-German Military Conversations of November, 1912* (Jour. Mod. Hist., June); Luigi Aldrovandi, *L'Armistizio con l'Austria-Ungheria: Frammenti di Diario* [verbatim report of interallied conversations between House, Lloyd George, Balfour, Clemenceau, Sonnino, Orlando and others, at which author was present, Oct. 28–Nov. 4, 1918] (N. Antol., Mar. 1).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

General review: H. Hale Bellot, *et al., General Collections of Reports of Parliamentary Debates for the Period since 1660* [Bibliographical Aids to Research] (Bull. Inst. Hist. Research, Feb.).

Bulletin Du Cange (ALMA), 1932, 2 contains an important and very useful Index of British and Irish Latin Writers, 400–1520. There are 900 authors listed by name and there is a supplementary list (pt. II.) covering General Collections, Monastic Cartularies, Municipal and Local History,

Episcopal Registers, Accounts, Wills, Legal Documents, thirty-nine Miscellaneous Items, twenty-nine titles for Scotland, and three for Ireland. The index has been compiled to facilitate the work of reading the texts from which British material for the new Du Cange will be drawn. G. C. B.

Those with pleasant memories of days in Oxford will find much to charm and instruct in Sir John A. R. Marriott's *Oxford, its Place in National History* (Oxford, Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, 1933, pp. viii, 206, $2.00). Oxford has played so important a part in the history of England that the author's narrative often turns aside from the purely academic aspects of his subject to deal with the broader course of events. This is especially true of the chapter on the Civil War and the Puritan Revolution, because Oxford was for several years the royalist capital. The author writes with most warmth of the New Learning and of John Colet.

The Cambridge University Press has published *Bolingbroke's Defence of the Treaty of Utrecht, being Letters VI.-VIII. of the Study and Use of History,* with an introduction by G. M. Trevelyan, and *Sir William Temple: Observations upon the United Provinces of the Netherlands,* with an introduction by G. N. Clark (Macmillan, pp. x, 150; xvi, 170, $1.35 each). The auspices under which these two little books are published suggest that they are intended for "students of history". Both are accessible in the larger libraries, however, and it is not clear just why either needed to be made immediately available. Sir William Temple's is much the more suitable piece of the two for inexperienced readers without editorial guidance, and Professor Clark's introduction to it is better adapted to the purpose it is intended to serve than is that of Professor Trevelyan to the sixth, seventh, and eighth of Bolingbroke's well-known *Letters on the Study and Use of History.* The latter indicates neither the circumstances under which Bolingbroke wrote nor his neglect of facts concerning domestic politics which, if introduced into the picture, would deprive his apologetic of much of its plausibility. Moreover, Professor Trevelyan's assumption that the "Bolingbroke of 1735–6, a man chastened by long years of proscription and exile . . . purged by a long penance of that violent partisanship that had made him, in an hour he never ceased to regret, the Pretender's secretary . . . looks back here upon his former self and his former actions from the standpoint of a political philosophy that was not quite that of Henry St. John" contains an element of truth, but is more apt to mislead than to help a student. W. T. L.

The English historian, Sir Charles Oman, has written a volume of memories under the title of *Things I have seen* (London, Methuen). These memories range from the Second Empire, when as a child Sir Charles saw the Prince Imperial drilling the cadets, to the upheaval in Italy of 1921. He

visited Hanover when "almost everybody's father or grandfather had earned the Waterloo medal" and feeling for England was still strong.

The John Rylands Library has reproduced in exact facsimile an interesting example of the rogue literature of the early seventeenth century of which it possesses the sole copy. The title is *Ratseis Ghost, or the Second Part of his Madde Prankes and Robberies.* Ratsey, it may be recalled, was a noted highwayman, who appropriately closed his career on the gallows in March, 1605. The introduction to the facsimile is by H. B. Charlton.

According to the *Eleventh Annual Report* of the Institute of Historical Research, University of London, no fewer than twenty-five Americans, scheduled as historians, archivists, or university teachers, were admitted during the past year. The number was ninety-one, if students were included. Harvard was represented by eight, Columbia by six, and Bryn Mawr and Mount Holyoke by four each. The *Theses Supplement, Number I.* of the February *Bulletin* is in two parts, containing particulars of historical theses completed and of theses in progress. The latter is an innovation suggested by the Anglo-American Historical Committee.

To the valuable University of London Intermediate Source-Books of History has been added number VIII., which deals with *England under Elizabeth, 1558–1603* (Longmans, Green, pp. xxv, 264, $3.20). The range of selection is wide. The introduction includes an extended descriptive Note on the Sources, followed by a Select List of Modern Works.

Sir Julian S. Corbett's *The Successors of Drake* (New York, Longmans, Green, 1933, pp. x, 466, $1.75), of which the first edition appeared in 1900, has been reissued for the third time. It is a sequel to his *Drake and the Tudor Navy.*

Great Britain from Adam Smith to the Present Day, an Economic Survey (Longmans, Green, pp. xii, 482, $3.20), by C. R. Fay, reader in Economic history at the University of Cambridge, has reached a third edition. It was originally published in 1928. There is a supplementary section bringing the account to 1932, and a bibliographical description of the contributions to the subject which appeared in the years 1928–1932.

The name of the author of *A Hundred Years of Quarter Sessions,* mentioned in the April number of this journal, should have been E. G. Dowdell, lecturer in economics at St. John's College, Oxford.

H. W. Saunders in *A History of the Norwich Grammar School* (Jarrold and Son, Norwich) adds another to a useful list of histories of the older English schools. For seven hundred years this school has played a part in education in its region.

Rhodes, by Sarah Gertrude Millin (Chatto and Windus), is a discriminating essay on the empire builder by one with intimate knowledge and understanding.

Spenser Wilkinson, the distinguished English writer on military problems and history, has published his memoirs under the title of *Thirty-Five Years, 1874–1909* (London, Constable). He was not a professional soldier and what prompted his studies of the art of war was the chance discovery, while spending an Oxford vacation on the Continent, that the "British Army was insignificant in comparison with those of the Great Powers of Europe". How he could have lived until Oxford days without realizing that fact is a mystery. At all events, he then determined to get at the bottom of the subject, not only of the technique and the strategy of military operations, but the relation of these things to national and imperial policy. So eminent were his attainments that upon the occasion of a visit to India he was consulted by no less a personage than Lord Roberts even upon tactical questions. His point of view makes his memoirs exceptionally illuminating.

Under a misleading title, *The British Way in Warfare,* Captain Liddell Hart has gathered in a single volume a variety of papers on military topics (New York, Macmillan Company, 1933). A first group (Part I.) discusses the conduct of various wars in the past from the standpoint of certain military theories—and in a rather controversial spirit. The rest of the volume deals more objectively with the development of European armies since 1918, and offers the general reader an interesting summary of new tactical ideas as well as the newer types of *matériel.* T. H. T.

The new volume of the British *History of the Great War* is entitled *Military Operations in Macedonia* (H. M. Stationery Office, 1933, 12*s* 6*d;* case of maps 5*s* 6*d*). The author is Captain Cyril Falls, and the maps were prepared by Major A. F. Becke. This volume carries operations to the spring of 1917. A second volume will complete the treatment.

Recent publications by H. M. Stationery Office are: *Register of Edward the Black Prince,* pt. IV., 1351–1365; *Calendar of Close Rolls, Henry V.,* vol. II., 1419–1422; *Calendar of State Papers,* Domestic series, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1683, edited by F. Blackburne Daniell; *Calendar of State Papers,* Domestic series, William III., Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1698, edited by Edward Bateson; *Public Record Office: Lists and Indexes,* no. LII., *List of Early Chancery Proceedings,* vol. IX.

Other books of interest are: *The London Weavers' Company,* vol. I. (Clarendon Press), by Frances Consitt [dealing with the struggle of the weavers in the Middle Ages to retain their privileges, and incidentally with the life of London in which they shared]; *Registrum Cancellarii Oxoniensis,*

1434–1469, 2 vols. (Oxford Historical Society), by H. E. Salter; *The Place-Names of Northamptonshire* (Cambridge University Press), by J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer, and F. M. Stenton; *Granville the Polite: the Life of George Granville, Lord Lansdowne* (Oxford University Press), by Elizabeth Handasyde; *The Industrial Revolution in North Wales* (University of Wales Press Board), by A. H. Dodd.

Articles: *John Richard Green* [apropos of the fiftieth anniversary of his death] (The Times Lit. Suppl., Mar. 9); Ruby Davis, *Bede's Early Reading* (Speculum, Apr.); J. S. P. Tatlock, *The Dragons of Wessex and Wales* (*ibid.*); Paul Fournier, *Note sur les Anciennes Collections Canoniques Conservées en Angleterre* (Rev. Hist. de Droit Franç. et Étrang., Jan.); R. R. Darlington, *Æthelwig, Abbot of Evesham* [II.] (Eng. Hist. Rev., Apr.); Geoffrey Baskerville, *Married Clergy and Pensioned Religious in Norwich Diocese* [II.] (*ibid.*, Apr.); E. M. Carus-Wilson, *The Origins and Early Development of the Merchant Adventurers' Organization in London as shown in their own Mediaeval Records* (Ec. Hist. Rev., Apr.); R. Stewart-Brown, *The 'Jury Book' of the County Court of Chester* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Apr.); H. Rothwell, *The Disgrace of Richard of Louth, 1297* (*ibid.*); Hilda Johnstone, *The Eccentricities of Edward II.* (*ibid.*); H. G. Richardson, *Lettres of the Legate Guala* (*ibid.*); William E. Morris, *The Beginnings of the House of Commons* (Pacific Hist. Rev., Mar.); A. F. Pollard, *Sir Thomas More's "Richard III."* (History, Jan.); C. Camden, jr., *Astrology in Shakespeare's Day* (Isis, Apr.); J. R. Crompton, *Catteshill and another Usher Serjeanty in the Purcel Family* (Bull. Inst. Hist. Research, Feb.); John W. Nef, *Richard Carmarden's "A Caveat for the Quene", 1570* (Jour. of Pol. Ec., Feb.); G. E. Fussell and V. G. B. Atwater, *Travel and Topography in Seventeenth Century England* (Trans. of the Bibl. Soc., Dec.); William M. Clyde, *Parliament and the Press, 1643–1647* (*ibid.*); John W. Fortescue, *A Side Show of the Eighteenth Century* (Blackwoods, Mar.); Bertha-M. Stearns, *Early English Periodicals for Ladies* (Pub. of the Mod. Lang. Ass., Mar.); Lord Ernle, *School and College Sixty Years Since* (Quar. Rev., Apr.); John Gore, *Thomas Creevy Reconsidered* (*ibid.*); C. D. Dudley, *Cobham's Cubs* (Notes and Queries, Apr. 15); W. A. Sanderson, *The Alienation of the Melbourne Parks* (Victorian Hist. Mag., Dec.); Gerald Byrne, *Early Days of the Mornington Peninsula* (*ibid.*).

Documents: E. Pole Stuart, ed., *A Letter from the Constable of Bordeaux to Edward II.'s Cofferer* (Bull. Inst. Hist. Research, Feb.); *Lleyn Ministers' Accounts, 1350–51* (Bull. of the Board of Celtic Studies, Nov.); Curtis Nettels, *British Payments in the American Colonies, 1685–1715* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Apr.).

FRANCE

General review: Albert Pingaud, *Les Livres d'Histoire: Autour de Napoléon* (Rev. des D. M., Mar. 1); M. M. Knight, *French Colonial Policy —the Decline of 'Association'* (Jour. Mod. Hist., June).

Vol. IV. of the *Répertoire Bibliographique de l'Histoire de France* (Paris, Rieder, pp. 480, 100 fr.), by Pierre Caron and Henri Stein, covers the years 1926 and 1927.

Something has already been said [*A. H. R.*, XXXIV. 575] about the character of the new edition of *La Chronique de Philippe de Vigneules*, of which the second volume, *De l'An 1325 à l'An 1473* (Metz, Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de la Lorraine, 1929, pp. 424), has now appeared, also edited by Charles Bruneau, of the University of Nancy. Since the second volume carries us only two years beyond the date of Philippe's birth, we cannot yet expect the interpretation of contemporary affairs, European and local, which he embodied first in his *Journal* and then in more finished form in the last fifty years of his *Chronique* (1474–1525). With the general chronicles which were his earlier sources we are already familiar, but we are less so with accounts of Metz and its environs. Under date of 1464 Philippe tells us that the greater part of what happened in the city up to that year he found narrated by a priest of St. Euchaire; touching what happened afterward until 1500 he had before him the "mémoire" of an eloquent fellow-citizen, Jehan Abrion (II. 350). Abrion has been edited and Philippe appears to have followed him closely; but it is not clear that the work of the priest survives in its original form. If not, items of local history not otherwise recorded are preserved in Philippe's second volume.

Among the most significant of these is the account of the "mutinerie" and "Jacquerie" of the lower classes of Metz against the "seigneurie" in 1406. Some of the latter were imprisoned, some fled from the town, one seignior was beheaded. For a year and five weeks the rebels ruled the city. The seigniors, recovering it, merely imprisoned at first but finally tossed 36 *des plus malvais* from the bridge into the river. Meanwhile the townsmen had suffered defeat at the hands of four great lords of the neighborhood, the result "of the bad government of these *Jaicques* who wished to do everything yet knew nothing". Other episodes of town life render the *Chronique* a microcosm of the age. H. L. G.

Newly Discovered French Letters of the Seventeenth, Eighteenth, and Nineteenth Centuries (Harvard University Press, 1933, pp. xvi, 288, $3.00) is vol. IX. of the Harvard Studies in Romance Languages. The collector and editor is Richmond Laurin Hawkins, associate professor of French in Harvard University. Of the whole number, 120, fifty-one have never been

printed before. The others have been printed for the editor in such widely distributed journals as to limit their practical availability. Among the earlier letters is one written to Benjamin Franklin by Marat concerning some experiments in electricity. To the historian probably the most interesting group is made up of nineteen letters from Alexis de Tocqueville to Theodore Sedgwick during the last years of Tocqueville's life, when he was engaged upon his work dealing with the Old Régime and the Revolution.

Sully: sa Vie et son Œuvre, by Henri Carré, is a clear, well-organized biography based especially on the mass of documents left by Sully himself (Paris, Payot, pp. 400, 32 fr.).

Vol. X. of the *Mémoires de Richelieu* (Paris, Champion, pp. 461, 40 fr.), edited by R. Lavollée, reaches the close of 1629. Some interesting light is thrown upon the relations of Richelieu and Cardinal de Bérulle. The volume deals for the most part with foreign affairs. An appendix contains extracts of letters written by Cardinal de Bérulle, copied for Richelieu.

The Société de l'Histoire de l'Inde Française has recently published the *Journal de Bussy, Commandant Général des Forces de Terre et de Mer dans l'Inde, 13 Novembre, 1781–31 Mars, 1783,* edited by A. Martineau (Paris, Leroux, 1933, pp. xxvi, 304, 20 fr.).

The reader of Henry de Jouvenel's *Huit Cents Ans de Révolution Française* (Paris, Hachette, pp. 256, 12 fr.) may not altogether accept the view of French history implied in the title of the volume, but he will be repeatedly delighted and stimulated by the illuminating interpretations of men and of events. The book belongs to the series L'Ancienne France.

In former days it was the practice to refer with mixed amusement and contempt to the paper money ventures of the French Revolutionary assemblies, but the fate which befell the mark and the franc in 1923 and 1924 has lessened the amount of humor to be discovered in the situation in France during the last year of the Convention and the first years of the Directory. Now that the dollar is beginning to wabble on, or off, its base former experiments with paper are more likely to awaken fear than amusement. Not a few are alarmed that bonds, government ones included, are to be paid in printing press money, whatever the contract may have specified. This happened during the French Revolution, and many debtors paid their creditors in depreciated assignats. But at least one banking house, belonging to heirs of Claude Périer, according to M. François Vermale (Les Dettes Privées sous la Révolution, *An. Hist. de la Rev. Fr.,* Mar.), reimbursed these unfortunate creditors in gold when the storm had passed and the bankers had reëstablished their fortune.

Students of the French Revolution are much indebted to Miss Beatrice

F. Hyslop for the publication of the *Répertoire Critique des Cahiers de Doléances pour les États Généraux de 1789* (Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1933, pp. 669). It belongs to the great Collection des Documents Inédits. The material was assembled in response to a circular letter sent to the French learned societies by the ministry of public instruction. When it became necessary to choose a compiler, Miss Hyslop, although a foreigner, was selected, as M. Camille Bloch explains, because of her exceptional knowledge of everything that concerns the convocation of the states general of 1789. "Son nom", he added, "s'est en quelque sorte imposé", a rare compliment. Under the head of each bailiwick or seneschalate, principal or secondary, is given the location of the manuscripts of the electoral record and of the cahiers. If these are printed, the bibliographical details are furnished. The introduction, in addition to a description of the electoral process, contains three finding lists of the various circumscriptions in order to facilitate the use of the main work. One of these lists gives the relations of the older circumscriptions to the present departments. At the end of the volume is an alphabetical list of all towns and parishes mentioned.

To the Nouvelle Bibliothèque d'Histoire Révolutionnaire, founded by the late Albert Mathiez, has recently been added a volume entitled *L'Éclairage de Paris à l'Époque Révolutionnaire* (Paris, Mellottée, 1933, pp. 300, 30 fr.), of which the author is Colonel Herlaut.

Additional intimate information concerning Napoleon II., especially during his last three years, has been discovered by Baron Jean de Bourgoing, in the private archives of the families of Counts Dietrichstein, Esterhazy, and Prokesch, and Baron Obenaus, who were closely associated with him. After editing *Papiers Intimes et Journal du Duc de Reichstadt* (Paris, Payot, 1930), the baron has more recently incorporated further documents from these sources in *Le Fils de Napoléon, Roi de Rome, Prince de Parme, Duc de Reichstadt, 20 Mars 1811–22 Juillet 1832* (Paris, Payot, pp. 389, 36 fr.). While Baron de Bourgoing has made his chief contribution in the discovery and exposition of new documentary materials, Octave Aubry, in *Le Roi de Rome* (Paris, Fayard, pp. 468, 16 fr. 50; English trans., by Elisabeth Abbott, Philadelphia, Lippincott, pp. 273, $3.50) has undertaken to elucidate the character and personal experiences of the duke, and to examine his relations with each of the limited group of persons closely associated with his career. Both writers are Bonapartists, already known for their contributions to Napoleonic history. These two centenary works neatly supplement one another, but the historian will still find Eduard von Wertheimer's *Der Herzog von Reichstadt* (1902, English trans., 1905) the indispensable basic work with the fullest consideration of political and diplomatic factors. Thanks to his literary skill, M. Aubry has produced a volume which has probably been more read than all the other lives of Napoleon II. combined. G. M. D.

In the edition of Chateaubriand's *Les Natchez* (Johns Hopkins Press, pp. 538), Professor Gilbert Chinard—with the assistance of a number of his students—has made an important contribution to the understanding of one of the most significant literary works of the early nineteenth century. The introduction discusses the history of the manuscript, and its sources, composition, and style. The elaborate notes to the text are full of interesting material on the intellectual history of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries. F. B. A.

Articles: Gaston Dodu, *Fustel de Coulanges* (Rev. des Études Hist., Jan.); Alfred de Curzon, *Alliances d'Autrefois: "The Auld Alliance" entre la France et l'Écosse* [1165–1783] (N. Rev., Mar. 1); L. Detrez, *Une Héroïne du XIV^e^ Siècle et l'État Civil d'un Vieux Français* (Rev. des Études Hist., Jan.); G. Dupont-Ferrier, *Les Institutions Françaises du Moyen Age vues à travers les Institutions de l'Antiquité Romaine* (Rev. Hist., Mar.); Adair G. Williams, *The Abjuration of Henry of Navarre* (Jour. Mod. Hist., June); Lucien Febvre, *Une Gigantesque Fausse Nouvelle: la Grande Peur de Juillet* '89 [apropos of a recent book by Georges Lefebvre] (Rev. de Synthèse, Feb.); Pierre Caron, *Le Fonds du Comité de Sûreté Générale* [at the Archives Nationales] (Rev. Fr., Jan.); Georges Lefebvre, *La Révolution Française et les Paysans* (An. Hist. de la Rév. Fr., Mar.); Jacques Godechot, *Les Insurrections Militaires sous le Directoire* (*ibid.*); Carl Ludwig Lokke, *Pourquoi Talleyrand ne fut pas envoyé à Constantinople* (*ibid.*); E. l'Hommedé, *Les Sénatoreries: Contribution à leur Histoire* (Rev. des Études Hist., Jan.); Louis Jean Adher, *Les Élections à la Chambre des Représentants, Mai 1815* (Rev. Fr., Jan.); Émile Dard, *Les Souvenirs Napoléoniens en Yougoslavie* (Rev. d'Hist. Diplomatique, Jan.); Victor Giraud, *La Vie Tragique de Lamennais* [I.-III., to be cont'd] (Rev. des D. M., Mar. 15, Apr. 1, May 1); Ernest Hauviller, *La Politique de Mgr. Le Pappe de Trévern* (Rev. Hist., Mar.); Jean-Marcel Jeanneney, *Les Disciples de Fourier et la Révolution de 1848* (Rev. des Sci. Pol., Jan.); A. Lajusan, *A. Thiers et la Fondation de la République, 1871–1877* (Rev. d'Hist. Mod., Nov., Jan.).

Documents: Pierre de Caraman, ed., *Coup d'Œil sur la France d'il y a Cent Cinquante Ans: Réflexions d'un Témoin* [extracts from the journal of Maurice de Riquet, Comte de Caraman, for the year 1782] (Rev. de Paris, Apr. 15); Georges Lefebvre, ed., *Documents sur la Grande Peur: Clermontois, Valois et Soissonnais* (An. Hist. de la Rév. Fr., Mar.); Pierre Caron, ed., *Lettres de Moreau, Député de Saône-et-Loire, à la Société Populaire de Chalon-sur-Saône, 11 Octobre, 1792–4 Juin, 1793* (Rev. Fr., Jan.); Marcel Blanchard, ed., *Le Journal de Michel Chevalier* [from March 15, 1855, to July 18, 1869] (Rev. Hist., Jan.); Prince Sixte de Bourbon, ed., *Voyage à Rome en 1839* [from the journal of the Comte de Chambord] (Rev. de Paris, May 1).

GERMANY, SWITZERLAND, AND CENTRAL EUROPE

General review: Robert Friedmann, *Ueber Thomas Müntzer* (Mitteil. des Oesterr. Inst. für Geschichtsf., XLVII. 1); Joseph Šusta, *Histoire de Tchécoslovaquie, 1925–1930* [I.] (Rev. Hist., Jan.).

Die Kreuzherren in den Rheinlanden by Robert Haass is a doctoral dissertation of Bonn University, dealing with the order of crusading canons from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century (Bonn, Röhrscheid, pp. xi, 243, 8.50 M.).

A contribution to the history of German law has been made by Wolfgang Schnelbögl's monograph, *Die Innere Entwicklung der Bayerischen Landfrieden des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Heidelberg, Winter, pp. 366, 18.50 M.). It forms Part 2 of vol. XIII. in the series Deutschrechtl. Beiträge, edited by K. Beyerle.

Vol. XII. of the *Mitteilungen* of the *Verein* for the history of Vienna embodies three articles: Der Mittelalterliche Bau des Domes zu St. Pölten, by Richard Kurt Donin; Der Wiener und Kremser Judeneid, by Dr. Hans Voltelini; and Zur Geschichte der Musik am Hofe Kaiser Maximilians I., by Dr. Leopold Nowak. The article by Herr Donin is illustrated with many plates.

J. B. Peltz, bishop of Metz, completes his *Études sur la Cathédrale de Metz* by a second volume, containing *Documents et Notes relatifs aux Années 1790 à 1930* (Metz, Le Lorrain, pp. xii, 437).

A monumental *Geschichte des Grossherzogtums Würzburg, 1806–1814,* is planned by Anton Chroust. The first volume deals with the foreign policy of this ephemeral state (Würzburg, Becker, pp. xiv, 617).

Vol. III. of the great official publication of Freiherr vom Stein's *Briefwechsel, Denkschriften und Aufzeichnungen,* edited by Erich Botzenhart (Berlin, Heymann, pp. xx, 717, 25 M.), has rapidly followed vol. I. Vol. II. is temporarily delayed.

The collection entitled *Quellen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte der Burschenschaft und der Deutschen Einheitsbewegung,* edited by Herman Haupt and Paul Wentzcke (Heidelberg, Winter), throws light upon the question whether the developments in Germany are a natural expression of the spirit of German youth at a time of national crisis. Vol. XIII. has been reached.

Professor Otto Hoetzsch's *La Politique Extérieure de l'Allemagne de 1871 à 1914* (Geneva, Institut Universitaire de Hautes Études Internationales, 1933, pp. 87, 6 fr.), in its tone of candor and reasonableness and its command of the documentary material, reminds the reader of Professor Erich Brandenburg's *Von Bismarck zum Weltkriege.* Professor Hoetzsch is also able to draw upon his own recollections as a member of the German national party in the Reichstag. He remarks that he knew Tirpitz very

well, having been seated beside him there for years. Professor Hoetzsch's admiration of Bismarck as a great peace statesman is unqualified, and he has used the first six volumes of the *Grosse Politik* as a textbook of diplomacy in training candidates for the diplomatic service. He appears to think, however, that the old emperor, William I., was better advised than Bismarck upon the question of the Austrian alliance. He believes too that William II., whatever his other faults, was more perspicacious than his advisers in regard to the dangers of encirclement after 1890. Another essay in the same series is Henry Wickham Steed's *The Antecedents of Post-War Europe* (1932, pp. 123, 7 fr.), which is mainly a defense of the peace settlement.

Vol. XV. of the edition of Bismarck's complete works is a critical edition of *Erinnerung und Gedanke* [Gedanken und Erinnerungen] (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft, pp. xxxix, 706, 27 M.), by Gerhard Ritter and Rudolph Stadelmann. Professor Ritter's introduction explains the genesis and growth of the work from the account which Herbert Bismarck wrote under the immediate impression of his father's dismissal, through Bismarck's dictations to Lothar Bucher to the final form after emendations and omissions. Incidentally a work projected as an instrument of combat became a volume of memoirs. This edition throws light upon many questions, especially upon the much discussed *Staatsstreichpläne* of Bismarck.

Though the constitution of the German republic has been studied several times, there has hitherto been no systematic narrative of the Weimar Assembly itself. This lacuna has been filled by Wilhelm Ziegler's *Die Deutsche Nationalversammlung 1919–1920 und ihr Verfassungswerk* (Berlin, Zentralverlag, pp. 372, 10 M.).

Under the title *Hunger,* General Landwehr, former chairman of the Austro-Hungarian committee in charge of the food supply from 1917 to 1918, has given an authoritative account of the tragic plight of the Dual Monarchy during the last half of the World War (Vienna, Amalthea-Verlag, pp. 323, 3 M.).

Articles: Ferdinand Güterbock, *Barbarossas Privileg für das Herzogtum Oesterreich: eine Methodologische und Fachwissensschaftliche Auseinandersetzung* (Hist. Zeitsch., Feb. 28); Hans von Greyerz, *Der Jetzerprozess und die Humanisten* [trial of Bernese monks for fraudulent miracles, 1507–1509] (Archiv des Hist. Vereins des Kantons Bern, XXXI. 2); Karl Schwarber, *Schweizerische Einflüsse auf die Entwicklung des Deutschen Patriotismus im 18. Jahrhundert: Isaak Iselin zum 150. Todestag* (Basler Zeitsch. für Gesch. und Altertumsk., XXXI.); Konrad Schünemann, *Die Wirtschaftspolitik Josephs II. in der Zeit seiner Mitregentschaft* (Mitteil. des Oesterr. Inst. für Geschichtsf., XLVII. 1); Gerhard Masur, *Naturrecht*

und Kirche: Studien zur Evangelischen Kirchenverfassung Deutschlands im 18. Jahrhundert (Hist. Zeitsch., Apr. 22); Gerhard Ritter, *Vom Jungen Stein* (*ibid.*); Kurt von Raumer, *Zur Deutschen Revolution von 1848* (*ibid.*); Robert R. Ergang, *Möser and the Rise of National Thought in Germany* (Jour. Mod. Hist., June); Wilhelm Groener, *Zum Hundertsten Geburtstag des Grafen Schlieffen* (Berl. Monatsh., Mar.); Friedrich Thimme, *Fürst Bülow und Graf Monts: ein Vervollständigter Briefwechsel* [I., concl., 1891–1895] (Preuss. Jahrb., Mar., Apr.); Ludwig Herz, *Rätsel um Fritz von Holstein: Glossen zu seinen Briefen an Ida von Stülpnagel* (*ibid.*, Feb.); Erich Otto Volkmann, *Probleme um den 9. November* [based on Eugen Fischer-Baling's *Volksgericht*] (*ibid.*); Wilhelm Groener, *German Military Power since Versailles* (Foreign Affairs, Apr.).

Documents: Eduard His, ed., *Briefwechsel zwischen Philipp Anton v. Segesser und Andreas Heusler-Ryhiner, 1842–1867* [126 letters between two conservative public men, Segesser of Lucerne, Heusler, editor of influential *Basler Zeitung* during a stormy political period in Switzerland] (Basler Zeitsch. für Gesch. und Altertumsk., XXXI.).

E. N. C.

ITALY

General review: Augustin Renaudin, *et al., Bibliographie des Travaux relatifs à l'Histoire Moderne de l'Italie* (Rev. d'Hist. Mod., Jan.); Gennaro Mondaini, *La Battaglia di Adua* [March 1, 1896] (N. Riv. Stor., Nov.).

A group of studies in the imperial administration centered at Pavia during the eleventh century has been made by Arrigo Solmi. The financial arrangements with which he is chiefly concerned throw light on legal and economic matters, notably the commercial relations between Italy and central Europe and between Italy and the Orient. The book is entitled *L'Amministrazione Finanziaria del Regno Italico nell' Alto Medioevo; col Testo delle "Honorantie Civitatis Papie" e con una Appendice di XVIII. Documenti* (Pavia, Biblioteca della Società Pavese di Storia Patria, pp. xvi, 287, 20 l.).

Professor Alain de Böuard has thrown valuable light on Angevin rule in Sicily by a collection entitled *Documents en Français des Archives Angevines de Naples, Régne de Charles Ier* (Paris, Boccard, pp. 210, 25 fr.).

Luigi Dal Pane has published the first volume of a work on *La Questione del Commercio dei Grani nel Settecento in Italia,* with special reference to the reforms of Pietro Leopoldo (Milan, Editr. Vita e Pensiero).

Two new studies of the non-political activities of Cavour have been made by V. Guli, *Il Piemonte e la Politica Economica del Cavour* (Naples, I. T. E. A., pp. 270) and A. Fossati, *Il Pensiero e la Politica Sociale di C. Cavour* (Turin, Feder. Fasc. del Commercio, pp. 163).

Articles: Walter Lenel, *Zur Forschung über die Fruhzeit von Florenz* (Hist. Zeitsch., Feb. 28); C. M. Ady, *The Character of an Italian Rural Commune, 1488* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Apr.); Lorenzo Mina, *Scritte, Motti ed Aforismi su Porte e Muri di Edifizii Sacri e Profani e su Oggetti in Casale Monferrato ed in Alessandria e Provincia* (Riv. di Stor., Arte e Arch. per la Prov. di Alessandria, Oct.); E. Chinea, *Dalle Antichi Botteghe d'Arti e Mestieri alle Prime Scuoli Industriali e Commerciali in Lombardia* (Arch. Stor. Lombardo, Mar.); Enzo Maganuco, *Lineamenti e Motivi di Storia dell' Arte Siciliana* (Arch. Stor. per la Sicilia Orient., XXVIII. 2); Stefano Bottari, *La Genesi dell' Architettura Siciliana del Periodo Normanno* (*ibid.*); Albert Pingaud, *Le Premier Royaume d'Italie: l'Œuvre Sociale* (Rev. d'Hist. Diplomatique, Jan.); Alessandro Guiccioli, *Nuove Pagine del "Diario Inedito", 1850–1863* [I.-IV., to be cont'd] (N. Antol., Mar. 16, Apr. 1, 16, May 1); Stefano Jacini, *La Question Romaine et la Convention de Septembre, 1860–1870* (Rev. d'Hist. Diplomatique, Jan.); Edmondo Cione, *Gli Eccidii Torinesi e De Sanctis Giornalista* [with extracts from letters and newspapers, September, 1864] (N. Riv. Stor., Nov.); Howard E. Jensen, *Fascism after Ten Years* (South Atlantic Quar., Apr.).

E. N. C.

NORTHERN EUROPE

The publication of the Danish sources for the history of the problem of North Schleswig for the years following the Dano-German war has now reached its third volume (*Det Nordslesvigske Spörgsmaal, 1864–1879,* III., Copenhagen, Koppel). The undertaking was planned by the editor, Aage Friis, and will be completed in five volumes. To these will be added a supplementary volume composed chiefly of documents antedating 1864. This will again be followed by a second series running into several volumes and made up of materials on the same problem but drawn from the great European archives outside Denmark.

An earlier phase of the same problem and its dynastic complications is the subject of a treatise by Otto Brandt, who has centered his research in the activities of the German-Russian diplomat, Caspar von Saldern (*Caspar von Saldern und die Nordeuropäische Politik im Zeitalter Katharinas II.,* Erlangen, pp. xviii, 301).

Christian Koren Wiberg, director of the Hanseatic Museum in Bergen, has published a volume on the social life in a city dominated by the merchants of Lübeck (*Hanseaterne og Bergen,* Grieg). The author holds that the reported social hostility between the natives and the alien merchants finds no support in the sources.

La Russie Moscovite, par S. F. Platonov (Paris, Boccard, pp. xii, 249) belongs to the series entitled *Histoire du Monde,* edited by E. Cavaignac.

It is the translation of a section of Platonov's larger work, which was translated into German six years ago.

Gwyn Jones, Some characteristics of the Icelandic *'Hólmganga'* (Jour. Eng. and Germ. Philol., Apr.), collates the evidence about this custom and takes sharp issue with Koht's denial that there ever was such a thing as *holmgang*. G. C. B.

Articles: Ingvar Andersson, *Erik XIV. och Lothringen* (Scandia, 1933, 1); Vilhelm la Cour, *Det Gamle Hedeby* (Tilskueren, Mar.); P. Munch, *Le Paysan Danois* (Rev. Hist., Jan.); W. Petzsch, *Die Neuen Ausgrabungen in Haithabu und die Beziehungen der Wikinger zu den Ländern südlich der Ostsee* (Nord. Rundschau, 1932, 3); Lauritz Weibull, *Gustaf II. Adolf och Kardinal-Richelieu* (Scandia, 1933, 1).

L. M. L.

THE FAR EAST

General review: K. Asakawa, *La Place de la Religion dans l'Histoire Économique et Sociale du Japon* (An. d'Hist. Éc. et Soc., Mar.).

In the volume of the well-known Japanese correspondent K. K. Kawakami, which is entitled *Manchoukuo, Child of Conflict* (Macmillan, 1933, pp. viii, 311, $2.00) certain points of view of unusual interest are presented, especially in the first chapter, The Storm Gathers. Here three elements are emphasized: The growing resentment of the army at reductions in its strength consequent upon the peace policies pursued since the close of the World War, the fears of the rural population, rapidly expanding and therefore driven more and more into marginal lands, and the increasing contempt on the part of the Chinese for all treaty obligations. It is the first of these elements that is not often pointed out. Evidently both the army and the navy have felt that their traditional veto power in the case of all decisions affecting the national defense has been ignored in the various disarmament agreements, and they were prepared to reassert themselves upon the first adequate opportunity. This came in September, 1931, and suddenly the whole scene changed. Other chapters deal with the new Manchoukuo government, its foreign relations and its ruler, the opium question, and the Open Door.

The World Peace Foundation of Boston has published under the title of *The Verdict of the League: China and Japan in Manchuria* the official documents together with an introduction and notes by Professor Manley O. Hudson, of the Harvard Law School.

Article: K. K. Kawakami, *Prince Ito's Confidential Papers* [apropos of a collection printed in Tokyo in 1931] (Foreign Affairs, Apr.).

UNITED STATES

GENERAL

General review: H. Hale Bellot, *The Mainland Colonies in the Eighteenth Century* (History, Jan.).

Among recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following may be noted: reproductions of eleven letters of Lafayette, 1779–1834; typewritten copy of diary of John Brown of Lewistown, Pa., 1794–1795; "Notes of Travel from the Diary of the late Isaac Draper, jr., M. D., Surgeon in the Service of His Majesty the Emperor of Russia at the Siege of Sevastopol", 1853–1855; papers of Anna Dickinson (five trunks); papers of Thomas F. Bayard, 1866–1897 (six large chests); papers of General Charles W. LeGendre (fifty manuscript volumes); papers of Louis F. Post, 1880–1922 (115 pieces); papers of Charles M. Dickinson, 1886–1924 (100 pieces); additional papers of William Howard Taft (several thousands); additional papers of American negroes (five hundred pieces).

The Library of Congress has issued volume III. of the *Records of the Virginia Company of London* (Government Printing Office, pp. xx, 769) edited by Professor Susan M. Kingsbury of Bryn Mawr College, and supplementing the two volumes of the Company's Court Book, published in 1906, by the publication in similar form of 273 related documents, 1607–1622. Volume IV. is in the printing office. Volume XXVIII. of the *Journals of the Continental Congress*, covering the first half of the year 1785, has also been issued. Volume XXIX., completing that year, is on the point of publication. Volumes XXX. and XXXI., covering 1786, are in page-proof but waiting the completion of their index.

The publication of the first three volumes of the Territorial Papers of the United States, which it was expected would be issued by the Department of State in the early autumn, has been postponed by reason of the economy measures of the government. The volumes in question, which include a preliminary short print introductory to the series, and papers concerning the Northwest Territory, will be held in type until such times as funds will again be made available. Copy for volumes embodying the official papers of the Southwest, Mississippi and Indiana territories are also withheld pending the passage of new appropriations by Congress. In the meantime the Department of State is carrying forward the preparation of copy for other volumes.

The Division of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington has in the printers' hands the sixth volume of the *Correspondance of Andrew Jackson*, covering the period from 1839 to 1845, and including also a selection of nearly a hundred letters of various earlier periods, from the additional Jackson manuscripts recently acquired by the Library of Congress.

A seventh volume, to be produced later, will provide a general index to the whole series.

The American Institute of Architects has appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Leicester B. Holland, of the Division of Fine Arts of the Library of Congress, with the purpose of preserving buildings of architectural importance or of great historical interest. The first step is to constitute a national list of such buildings. England and France have such lists, and the buildings are safeguarded by law from demolition or even alteration. Dr. Holland deprecates the practice of museums of removing typical interiors from old buildings and installing them as exhibits in the museums themselves.

The Department of History of Yale University will publish shortly the second volume of *The Correspondence of General Thomas Gage with the Secretaries of State and with the War Office and the Treasury, 1763 to 1775.* The editor is Dr. Clarence E. Carter.

The Naval War College has issued another volume of *International Law Situations, with Solutions and Notes,* by Professor George G. Wilson. This is the series for 1931. *A General Index to International Law Situations,* volumes I. to XXX., 1901–1930), has also been published (Washington, Government Printing Office).

The one volume edition of *The Rise of American Civilization* (Macmillan, 1933, pp. 824, 865, $3.50), by Charles and Mary Beard, has been revised and enlarged. The principal addition is chapter XXX. with the suggestive title of The Mirage Dissolves. In reading it one experiences again the keen intellectual pleasure, attended by mixed emotions of another sort, which *Only Yesterday* produced. This chapter begins where that book left off. The philosophical outlook is broader. The wit is sparkling, although the humor is at times caustic. In such a mood, in another passage, the authors play with the efforts of the learned to explain the phenomena of the depression. Even the historians, among whom the authors are themselves numbered, do not escape the shafts. The historians, it is remarked, "were supposed to know something about the 'laws of historical development' and possess some insight into crises and revolutions, but if any among them felt an urge to illuminate the heavens by kindling some oil from Clio's lamp, he suppressed it before publication day".

The volume entitled *Revolution: 1776,* by John Hyde Preston (Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1933, pp. 440) covers the years 1768–1783, with its chief emphasis upon the more spectacular aspects of the American Revolution. The author, after providing what is in some respects a very superficial account of the preliminaries of the main contest, seldom refers more than casually to important events outside the immediate area of physical combat. The descriptions of military and naval operations are better done; but the author's numerous criticisms of strategy are not always convincing. As for many of the

greater and lesser individuals of the period, their personal appearance, drinking, cursing, and love-making receive a generous amount of space. The book, throughout, is intimate in content, and is abundantly expressive of Mr. Preston's desire to shatter illusions created by "those fantastic fairy-tales we call textbooks" (p. 77). An impressive critical bibliography and a satisfactory index have been included, but no footnotes. R. W. I.

The late Professor Thomas Francis Moran's volume on *American Presidents, their Individualities and their Contributions to American Progress* (Crowell, 1933, pp. xii, 318, $2.50) has reached a fifth edition, with revisions by Professor Louis Martin Sears, who has added a few brief pages on Mr. Hoover and Mr. Roosevelt.

The title of Hamilton Basso's *Beauregard, the Great Creole* (Scribner's 1933, pp. xiv, 327, $3.50) suggests a familiar device of the new biography, but this nickname has a different origin; it comes from the toast given him on April 24, 1861, at Charleston, "To the Great Creole", who had forced the surrender of Sumter. The author's aim is at once to interpret the somewhat peculiar temperament of the man and to recreate the atmosphere of the time and place in which he lived. Mr. Basso has used good sources, for he has had access to the Beauregard papers in New Orleans and to other original letters and diaries. He has also drawn upon the New Orleans newspapers of the day. His list of secondary material is rather miscellaneous, and contains no military history of weight. It must be conceded that he tells his story well, for it is a story rather than a full-length biography. At times his narrative is marred by phrases of bitter hatred and contempt for the Northern soldier, although he disclaims holding the view prevalent in the South at the opening of the struggle. As to Beauregard, the author feels that he was deprived by President Davis's shortsightedness of adequate opportunity to display his real abilities as a strategist. The last years of his life were spent in penury, relieved by an honest, although not honorable, connection with the Louisiana lottery.

A good example of the value for economic history of the study of particular industries is to be found in *The History of the Quaker Oats Company* (University of Chicago Press, 1933, pp. xi, 279, $3.00), by Harrison John Thornton, assistant professor of history in the University of Iowa. The records of the company have been placed at the disposition of Dr. Thornton, who has also had the advantage of conversation with some of the early organizers of the milling business. The bibliography shows the utilization of large bodies of other material. If the reader of the book, under the illusion of his daily contact with the subject at the breakfast table, should suppose that he knows all about Quaker Oats, he will suffer a mild surprise as he discovers that this business, like the basic industries of steel and oil, has passed through the various stages of pioneering, individual enterprise, cutthroat competition, trust agreements, tested by government

prosecution, and consolidation. The more picturesque phases of the history of oats, oatmeal, and the breakfast table have not been neglected by the author.

Native American Anarchism, a Study of Left-Wing American Individualism, by Eunice Minette Schuster, belongs to the series of Smith College Studies in History. Miss Schuster's investigations were carried on under the guidance of Professor Merle E. Curti. They cover the whole range of American experience, from the attitudes and opinion of the Antinomians in the early days of the Massachusetts Bay Colony to the career of Emma Goldman, herself not an American, in the United States. It is evidently a work of thorough scholarship and intelligent interpretation.

A volume of value in the artistic and literary history of the United States is *William Bartram, Interpreter of the American Landscape,* by N. Bryllion Fagin, associate in English, The Johns Hopkins University (Johns Hopkins Press, 1933, pp. ix, 229, $2.25).

To the series of books published under the auspices of the Milton Academy Alumni War Memorial Foundation have been added two volumes: *America in the World War,* by Major-General James G. Harbord, and *The Unfinished Task,* by Sir Frederick Whyte, political advisor to the National Government of China (Houghton Mifflin, 1933, pp. 111, $2.00; pp. 52, $1.50). General Harbord's address gains special interest from his rôle in the war and from the personal reminiscences in which it abounds. Sir Frederick deals with the League of Nations as an experiment in social coöperation on an international scale. The present moment, he believes, is critical because economic collapse has added new national barriers. When it comes to questions of disarmament, "none seem to know how to cross the yawning gulf of distrust which separates them from the promised land" of "a better security founded on coöperation".

Articles: Thomas P. Martin, *The National Archives Building* (Hist. Outlook, Apr.); Käthe Spiegel, *Charakterzüge der Amerikanischen Geschichte* (Hist. Vierteljahr., XXVIII. 1); C. C. Benson, *American Military History* (Cavalry Jour., Mar.); August C. Krey, *History in the Machine Age* (Minnesota Hist., Mar.); U. Waldo Cutler, *What and Why the Forefathers Read, with a Brief Review of the Best Seller of Three Hundred Years Ago* [Foxe's Book of Martyrs] (Worcester Hist. Soc. Publications, Apr.); Gilbert J. Garraghan, *Ecclesiastical Rule of Old Quebec in Mid-America* (Cath. Hist. Rev., Apr.); J. W. Wright, *Notes on the Continental Army* (William and Mary College Quar. Hist. Mag., Apr.); R. Earl McClendon, *Daniel Webster and Mexican Relations: the Santa Fe Prisoners* (Southwestern Hist. Quar., Apr.); Earl D. Ross, *Horace Greeley and the Beginnings of the New Agriculture* (Agricultural Hist., Jan.); Roy Marvin

Robbins, *Horace Greeley: Land Reform and Unemployment, 1837–1862* (*ibid.*); Richard R. Stenberg, *An Unnoted Factor in the Buchanan-Douglas Feud* (Jour. of the Illinois State Hist. Soc., Jan.); Harrison A. Trexler, *Coaling the Confederate Commerce Raiders* (Georgia Hist. Quar., Mar.); John D. Hicks, *The Third Party Tradition in American Politics* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., June); Edwin Ryan, *The Oxford Movement in the United States* (Cath. Hist. Rev., Apr.); Robert M. Hughes, *Joseph Eggleston Johnston, Soldier and Man* (William and Mary College Quar. Hist. Mag., Apr.); Georg Leibbrandt, *The Emigration of the German Mennonites from Russia to the United States and Canada, 1873–1880* [II.] (Mennonite Quar. Rev., Jan.); Harold S. Bender, *Was William Rittenhouse the First Mennonite Bishop in America?* (*ibid.*); Frederick C. Fiechter, jr., *The Preparation of an American Aristocrat* [Mr. Justice Holmes] (New Eng. Quar., Mar.); N. A. Weston, *Ricardian Epoch in American Economics* (Am. Ec. Rev., Mar.); Meribeth E. Cameron, *American Recognition Policy toward the Republic of China, 1912–1913* (Pacific Hist. Rev., Mar.); Richard W. Van Alstyne, *Private American Loans to the Allies, 1914–1916* (*ibid.*); Henry L. Stimson, *Bases of American Foreign Policy during the Past Four Years* (Foreign Affairs, Apr.).

Letters and documents: *Archibald Robertson's Diaries, 1762–1780* [IV.] (Bull. N. Y. Public Library, Apr.); *Bamford's Diary* [Capt. William Bamford, 40th Regiment of Foot, British] (Maryland Hist. Mag., Mar.); *Letters of Thomas Jefferson to William Short* [V.] (William and Mary College Quar. Hist. Mag., Apr.); *The War Letters of Father Peter Paul Cooney of the Congregation of Holy Cross* [I.] [Written during the Civil War] (Amer. Cath. Hist. Soc., Mar.).

NEW ENGLAND, MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

Two volumes of the *History of the State of New York* have appeared. This work, issued under the auspices of the New York State Historical Association, will comprise ten volumes. It is under the general editorship of Alexander C. Flick, assisted by an advisory board, the members of which are Dixon Ryan Fox, Alexander J. Wall, Victor H. Paltsits, A. J. F. van Laer, and Peter Nelson. The publisher is the Columbia University Press. The price is $5.00 a volume.

The New York State Historical Association continues its activity in the publishing field with the issuance from the Columbia University Press of Mr. Howard Swiggett's *War Out of Niagara*, the first full-length study of the career of Walter Butler, Loyalist captain of frontier rangers during the Revolution. Mr. Swiggett's work is based on hitherto unpublished manuscripts and is strongly at variance with the legends propagated by early 19th century historians. This is the second of the association's series of

monographs, the first, Mr. E. Wilder Spaulding's *New York during the Critical Period* having appeared last December. The association's manuscript survey is being prosecuted with some success. Among the records that have been placed in the archives of the association at Ticonderoga are some fifty account books and journals (1820–1868) relating to the tin, hat, lumber, farm, mercantile, post office, and other business of John Hatch Low of Westport, a pioneer industrialist of the Champlain Valley. Another miscellaneous collection of manuscripts extending from 1766 to 1829 includes an interesting letter from William H. Seward, written from Union College in 1820, and another from Sir John Johnson in 1784. A part of the political correspondence of Judge A. C. Hand of Elizabethtown, N. Y., extending from 1825 to 1860 has also been received, as well as a number of legal manuscripts of Judge H. H. Ross of Essex embracing the years 1811–1861. The association further evidences its state of healthy activity by the fact that it has added about five hundred new members to its rolls in the past year and a half. Biographers of New Yorkers may be interested to know that the association has recently received from the common council of the city of Albany, for display at Ticonderoga, a notable collection of oil portraits of governors of the state. The thirty-eight portraits include all governors between George Clinton and Charles E. Hughes, with the exception of Tayler, Pitcher, and Robinson, as well as several mayors of Albany. J. P. B.

New York University at its inception a hundred years ago called together a large group of "Literary and Scientific Gentlemen" to advise with its sponsors upon questions of educational policy. This meeting was held in the "Common Council Chamber" of New York in October, 1830. In recognition of the wisdom of that action another conference, held in New York on November 15-17, 1932, became a part of the centenary exercises of the university. The university has now issued as two of its centennial publications a facsimile of the *Journal of the Proceedings of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen,* printed in 1831 (pp. 286), and a volume entitled *The Obligation of Universities to the Social Order* (New York University Press, 1933, pp. xlv, 503). The two volumes are made up of addresses delivered on these occasions by distinguished guests.

The Pennsylvania Historical Association which was planned at preliminary conferences held at State College during the last year was formally launched at Lehigh University on April 28 and 29, 1933. This new organization is designed to serve as a coördinating body to supplement and make more effective the efforts of the local historical societies and their federation in the commonwealth; its general objects are to promote scholarly activity and the teaching of state history in the schools and colleges of the commonwealth.

At the Lehigh sessions which were planned by a committee headed by Professor Lawrence H. Gipson of that university, a number of papers were presented on themes connected with local history. Two which were more significant as far as general interest is concerned were those dealing with present research projects in the field of Pennsylvania, given by Professor Paul W. Gates of Bucknell University, and an account of some of the manuscript resources of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, presented by Ernest Spofford, librarian of that organization. The new organization hopes soon to publish these papers and make them available for historical scholars generally.

The main feature of the occasion was the inauguration dinner at which Professor Dixon Ryan Fox of Columbia University, president of the New York State Historical Association, delivered an address which he called "Greetings from a Neighbor", in which he gave the new organization stimulating advice based upon the successful experience of his own organization. He concluded with the significant statement, "You have seized what was perhaps the greatest opportunity for this sort of historical service that remained in America". The new organization was completed by the adoption of a constitution prepared by a committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Solon J. Buck, of the Western Pennsylvania Historical Survey, and by the election of the following officers: Hon. A. Boyd Hamilton, secretary of the Pennsylvania State Senate, president; Professor Roy F. Nichols, of the University of Pennsylvania, vice president; Professor Paul W. Gates, of Bucknell University, secretary; Mr. Ross Pier Wright, of the State Historical Commission, treasurer. R. F. N.

The Friends Historical Association has published a *General Index* to the *Bulletin,* vols. XVI.-XX. It may be obtained of the secretary at Haverford, Pa., for $1.50.

The Religious Society of Friends has issued a little volume entitled *William Penn, a Short Life with Selections from his Writings* (John C. Winston Company, 1932, pp. 63, 75 cents). The biographical section is by Joseph Haines Price, and the selections are made by Stanley R. Yarnell, who is principal of Germantown Friends School. At the end is a list of Books on William Penn, with brief comments.

Articles: Samuel Eliot Morison, *Nathaniel Eaton, First Head of Harvard College* (Harvard Graduates Mag., Mar.); John C. Miller, *Religion, Finance, and Democracy in Massachusetts* [in the 1740's] (New Eng. Quar., Mar.); R. S. Longley, *Mob Activities in Revolutionary Massachusetts* (*ibid.*); Hervey P. Prentiss, *Pickering and the Embargo* (Essex Inst. Hist. Coll., Apr.); Bertha-Monica Stearns, *Two Forgotten New England Reformers* [Mary Gove Nichols and Dr. Thomas L. Nichols in the 1840's and 1850's] (New Eng. Quar., Mar.); Ettie C. Hedges, *Colonial Travelers on*

Long Island (New York History, Apr.); Milton W. Hamilton, *The Spread of the Newspaper Press in New York before 1830* (*ibid.*); Charles J. DeWitt, *Crusading for Peace in Syracuse during the War with Mexico* (*ibid.*); William H. Richardson, *George Washington and Jersey City* (Proceedings, New Jersey Hist. Soc., Apr.); A. Van Doren Honeyman, *Concerning the New Jersey Royalists in the Revolution* (*ibid.*); William W. Comfort, *William Penn* (General Mag. and Hist. Chron., Apr.); M. Atherton Leach, *Gulielma Maria Springett, First Wife of William Penn* (Pennsylvania Mag. of Hist. and Biog., Apr.); Arthur C. Bining, *The Iron Plantations of Early Pennsylvania* (*ibid.*); Roy H. Johnson, *Frontier Religion in Western Pennsylvania* (Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag., Feb.); David K. McCarrell, *The Coming of the Railroad to Western Pennsylvania* (*ibid.*); John E. Reynolds, *The Venango Trail in the French Creek Valley* (*ibid.*).

Documents: Dorothy S. Towle, ed., *Smuggling Canary Wine in 1740* [from the records of the Rhode Island court of vice-admiralty] (New Eng. Quar., Mar.).

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

Under the auspices of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Social Science Research Council, Mr. Wilson Gee, of the University of Virginia, has endeavored to discover the factors now retarding research in the social sciences in the South (*Research Barriers in the South*, Century Company, 1932, pp. ix, 192, $2.25). He does this chiefly by a comparative study of 42 universities and colleges of the South and 57 of the North and West, and draws the following general conclusions: that the South is only recently beginning to recover from the severe setback caused by the Civil War and to return to the early scholarly interest attributable especially to Jefferson; that the South has suffered greatly from the migration to the North and West of its scholars; that the salary range in Southern colleges is one-third lower than in other parts of the country whereas living costs are relatively the same; that the teaching load of the Southern professor is usually thirty per cent. heavier than that of his colleague in Northern and Western institutions; and that, in spite of a generally sympathetic attitude toward research on the part of university administrations in the South, there is a distressing lack of provision for the grant of either time or money to the professor who would combine research with teaching. J. W. W.

The volume on *Charles Parish, York County, Virginia, History and Registers: Births, 1648–1789; Deaths, 1665–1787*, by Landon C. Bell, published by the Virginia State Library Board, marks another step in its commendable program to make accessible in printed form all the extant parish records of colonial Virginia. The Charles Parish book is of particular interest

because it is the oldest of the few original church records of seventeenth century Virginia. Mr. Bell, who has already done noteworthy editing of parish and county records, has rearranged the material in two alphabetical lists, of births and deaths respectively, in order to facilitate the use of the data. In three prefatory chapters he gives a brief history of the parish, including a prolonged controversy between the minister, the Rev. James Sclater, and the vestry; an account of each of the nine ministers (to 1793); and a description of the register which is in the Virginia State Library. The register contains approximately 3000 births (of which the names most numerous are Drewry 97, Cook(e) 64, Presson 58, Patrick 55, Kirby 54, Robinson 52), and 1718 deaths. L. J. C.

As 1933 is the bicentennial of the beginnings of education in Savannah, Mr. Haygood S. Bowden, of the Savannah High School, has prepared a memorial volume entitled *Two Hundred Years of Education* (Richmond, Dietz Printing Company, 1932, pp. xv, 381). Of particular interest is the account of the earlier academies and of the steps taken to organize the public school system.

Various recently acquired manuscripts constitute the nucleus for the proposed Great Plains History Collection at the University of Texas. Though the collection will bear upon many phases of Western life—transportation, mining, dry farming, irrigation—these first materials deal with ranching operations in the West and illustrate something of the initial settlement of the region.

Among the most extensive operators in the Southwest were Jot Gunter, W. B. Munson, and John Summerfield, land agents, surveyors, and ranchmen. Their records, comprising two large collections acquired from the Gunter and Summerfield families, cover the period from 1870 to 1910 and contain 40,212 documents relating to the survey, sale, and settlement of the public domain in Texas. The 5471 documents in the C. U. Connellee collection approximate the same period and field. The private files of Frank S. Hastings, author and range authority, totaling approximately 35,000 pages of manuscript, pertain to his connection with Swenson's SMS Ranch from 1902 to 1922. These papers are illustrative of the problems of a large ranch to-day. The SMS still comprises more than 350,000 acres of land. The files of J. M. Daugherty, pioneer ranchman and trail driver, extend from 1870 to 1905 and contain approximately 2000 pieces. They deal with trail and range life of central Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, and with the large "Figure 2" Ranch of the Trans-Pecos country. The John A. E. Knight transcripts, diaries, correspondence, and account books, comprising 1087 pages, concern overland journeys, the trailing of cattle, and range problems between 1850 and 1890. The D. H. and J. W. Snyder manuscript books record the business details of a ranch and trail partner-

ship that extended its operations from Texas to Montana during the last half of the nineteenth century. Something of the history of the U Ranch, the first settlement on the head of the North Concho River, in Texas, is to be found in the George H. McEntire collection of 873 documents dating from 1874 to 1906. Supplementing these materials for that part of the state west of the one hundredth meridian are scattered documents and transcripts concerning James C. Cator, Ben C. Mayes, James Cook, Robert Moody, and other pioneer cowmen.

From the extreme southern portions of the Great Plains are records pertaining to Ed C. Lasater's ranches, while the Woodhull papers relate to smaller operations in the same region. The McFaddin manuscript books, 1842–1892, indicate changing range practices and the growth of a pioneer family. Abel H. Pierce, one of the most colorful of cow country personalities, is represented by 428 original documents, 1871–1890. The Joseph Henry Polley transcripts, from the Lavaca country, number 977 documents falling within the period 1828 to 1900. The most significant of the Coastal Plains papers yet received are those of the Coleman-Fulton Pasture Company. Dating from 1860 to 1900, these and related documents, which have been given by descendants of Governor Henry Smith and Colonel George W. Fulton, pertain to early meat packing efforts, coastal transportation of live beef, and the transition of the open range to a land of farming settlers. The Duncan, Tait and Bolton Plantation records indicate the nature of pastoral life in the transition zone that divided the farming and range regions of Texas. These and other manuscript materials, diaries, account books, business papers and letters, relating to one of the basic industries of the pioneer and present West, and totaling more than 130,000 documents, constitute the beginnings of The Great Plains History Collection. Quest for additional sources will proceed from south to north, cutting across the traditional lines of settlement while following the trend of the expanding cow country. Dr. W. P. Webb's proposal for the establishment of this collection is meeting with favor. J. E. H.

Articles. *Lower Norfolk County Records,* 1636–1646 [cont'd] (Virginia Mag. of Hist. and Biog., Apr.); Clarence H. Urner, *Early Baptist Records in Prince George County, Virginia* (*ibid.*); G. MacLaren Brydon, *The Clergy of the Established Church in Virginia and the Revolution* [cont'd] (*ibid.*); R. Walton Moore, *George Mason, the Statesman* (Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Apr.); Lyon G. Tyler, *Arthur Lee, a Neglected Statesman* [cont'd] (*ibid.*); G. G. Johnson, *The Camp Meeting in Ante-Bellum North Carolina* (North Carolina Hist. Rev., Apr.); Géza Schütz, *Additions to the History of the Swiss Colonization Projects in Carolina* (*ibid.*); R. H. Woody, *Franklin J. Moses, jr., Scalawag Governor of South Carolina, 1872–1874* (*ibid.*); Edgar Legare Pennington, *Begin-*

nings of the Church of England in Georgia [II.] (Hist. Mag. of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Mar.); Z. T. Johnson, *Geographic Factors in Georgia Politics in 1850* (Georgia Hist. Quar., Mar.); Sally Dart and Edith Dart Price, *The Jamaica Pirates and Louisiana Commerce, 1739, with Documents translated by the late Mrs. H. H. Cruzat* (Louisiana Hist. Quar., Apr.); Reed McC. B. Adams, *New Orleans and the War of 1812* (*ibid.*); Lane C. Kendall, *The Interregnum in Louisiana in 1861* (*ibid.*); Amelia Williams, *A Critical Study of the Siege of the Alamo and of the Personnel of its Defenders* [I.] (Southwestern Hist. Quar., Apr.).

Documents: Mabel L. Webber, ed., *Josiah Smith's Diary, 1780–1781* [cont'd] (South Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Apr.); Harriet Smither, ed., *Diary of Adolphus Sterne* (Southwestern Hist. Quar., Apr.).

WESTERN STATES

The Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association was held in Chicago on April 13, 14, and 15, at the invitation of the Illinois State Historical Society and of the Chicago Historical Society. It was natural that in the year which completes the first century of Chicago's development the principal themes for discussion should be chosen from the history of Chicago and of Illinois. Religion and Politics in Illinois were subjects of two sessions. The subjects of other sessions were Frontier History, Wilkinson's Career, the West and the Southwest, the Indians and the Fur Trade. The Presidential Address, by Professor John D. Hicks, was on The Third Party Tradition in American Politics. An occasion of special interest was the luncheon at the Century of Progress Exposition and a personally conducted tour of the grounds. In addition to the historical sessions there were round table discussions on economics, political science, sociology, and philosophy, and another which discussed the approach to history from these various points of view. There was also a conference of historical societies.

Dr. Willard Rouse Jillson is a scientist whose absorbing interest, aside from geology, is the early literature of Kentucky history. He has already provided us with facsimiles of Filson's *Kentucke* with its accompanying map; of Fitzroy's *Xentuckie Country,* and now brings out *A Transylvanian Trilogy.* This is the story of the writing of Harry Toulmin's 1792 "History of Kentucky" combined with a sketch of his life and a new bibliography, to which are added an "Exact Reprint of Toulmin: 1792 and A Facsimile Reprint of Russell's Map of Kentucky, 1794". The "trilogy" is Dr. Jillson's interpretation of Toulmin's threefold *Thoughts on Emigration to which are added Miscellaneous Observations relating to the United States of America and a Short Account of the State of Kentucky.* These were

not combined into a single volume, but issued separately, the *Thoughts on Emigration* in October, 1792; the *Description of Kentucky* in November of the same year. As the editor says, this latter is a rarity much prized by collectors, but containing nothing new, merely a compilation by a young and scholarly dissenting English minister who was so impressed with his thoughts on emigation that he took his own advice and emigrated to America the next year. Singularly he became president of Transylvania Seminary in Lexington and secretary of state for Kentucky, removing in 1804 to Alabama, where he passed the remainder of his life. Dr. Jillson writes entertainingly if somewhat floridly of this early emigrant; he makes several errors of fact and phrase in his introduction. Toulmin was at Chowbent, Lancashire, not Chorobert, when he wrote his pamphlets. He did not come to America with Joseph Priestley (not Priestly) who landed in New York in 1794, not in Norfolk in 1793. The "great Pitt" of that day was not the Earl of Chatham. Altogether the editor's introduction leaves much to be desired; but the facsimile is excellent. L. P. K.

The publishing house of B. H. Murphy, Nashville, Tenn., has issued a complete reprint of Elihu Embree's *The Emancipator* (1932, pp. xi, 112, $4.50), which originally appeared in Jonesborough, Tenn., in 1820, the year of Embree's death. It is reprinted from the file in possession of the Tennessee History Society, said to be the only complete file in existence. There have been added two memorials on slavery presented to the legislature of Tennessee in 1817 upon which Embree's name appears as a signer.

The Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society has published *An Index and List of the Letters and Papers of Rutherford Birchard Hayes, Nineteenth President of the United States*, which are found at the Hayes Memorial Library, Fremont, Ohio. This index is the work of Miss Ruth M. Boring. In the same pamphlet are notes on other source material in the collection. The librarian will be glad to send copies of the *Index*, free of charge, to members of the American Historical Association who may request them.

The Fourteenth Annual Indiana History Conference was held at Indianapolis on December 9 and 10 under the joint auspices of the Society of Indiana Pioneers, the Indiana Historical Society, and the Indiana Historical Bureau. The proceedings are printed in the *Indiana History Bulletin* for March. Among the papers of special interest were The Newspaper as a Source of Historical Information, by Joseph W. Piercy, and Historical Marking: the Revolutionary Period in Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana, by A. D. Hosterman.

The archæological work of the Indiana Historical Society and the Historical Bureau has resulted in a further report entitled *The Archaeology of Greene County* (pp. 319, plates 36), by Glenn A. Black. Dr. Christopher

B. Coleman, director of the Historical Bureau, in a foreword expresses the opinion that this study "throws new light on the identity of the mound-building culture".

Among the accessions of manuscripts in the Indiana State Library are the papers of Daniel D. Pratt, United States Senator 1869–1875; those of the late Thomas R. Marshall, and some papers of William Dudley Foulke, of the years 1849-1931.

The papers presented before the Abraham Lincoln Association at Springfield, on February 12, 1932, have now appeared in a small but handsomely printed volume entitled *Abraham Lincoln Association Papers* (Springfield, 1933, pp. 158). The papers are Lincoln, the Constitutional Lawyer, by John Maxcy Zane, and The Environs of Lincoln's Youth, by Louis A. Warren. The president of the association, Mr. Logan Hay, has written an introduction.

The Knox College Library has received the Preston Player Collection of books, maps, and prints about the Mississippi River.

The only regret that the reader feels as he lays down the volume entitled *William Watts Folwell, the Autobiography and Letters of a Pioneer of Culture* (The University of Minnesota Press, 1933, pp. 287, $3.00) is that Dr. Folwell did not give a fuller account of his experiences, especially after he became the first president of the University of Minnesota. The first eight chapters, carrying the narrative as far as the close of the Civil War, were dictated to his secretary in 1920. The story was completed shortly before his death in 1929. His account of his youth and years of education is fascinating. The impelling force of his native gifts carried him swiftly beyond obstacles apparently insuperable. The editor of the *Autobiography*, Dr. Solon J. Buck, has supplemented the narrative by selections from Dr. Folwell's letters and by documents which illustrate his activities in Minnesota.

Arrangements have been completed by the Colonial Dames of America in Minnesota to publish through the University of Minnesota Press five diaries of eighteenth century Canadian fur traders, four of the five hitherto unpublished. Manuscripts of these diaries are in the possession of McGill University in Montreal and the Public Archives of Canada in Ottawa, from which the Minnesota Historical Society obtained photostatic copies. Publication of these documents was undertaken as part of the Colonial Dames' project to "coördinate, stimulate, and increase the historic activities of the state societies, to encourage historic research and the preservation of old records, manuscripts, and pamphlets". The diaries to be published are those of Peter Pond, John Macdonell, Archibald McLeod, Hugh Faries, and Thomas Connor. They have been edited by Charles M. Gates. Grace Lee Nute, curator of manuscripts for the Minnesota Historical Society and

author of *The Voyageur,* supplies a general introduction. Under the title *Five Fur Traders of the Northwest* the diaries will be published together in one volume during the summer of 1933.

Railroad Consolidation West of the Mississippi River, by Stuart Daggett, is no. 2, vol. XI., of the University of California Publications in Economics.

Articles: Thomas F. Cleary, *Huet de la Valinière* (Mid-America, Apr.); Leland D. Baldwin, *Shipbuilding on the Western Waters, 1793–1817* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., June); Ralph B. Guinness, *The Purpose of the Lewis and Clark Expedition* (*ibid.*); Earle D. Ross, *Horace Greeley and the West* (*ibid.*); H. C. Hubbart, *"Pro-Southern" Influences in the Free West, 1840–1865* (*ibid.*); Louis W. Campbell, *The "Oak Openings" of Northwestern Ohio* (Bull., Hist. Soc. of Northwestern Ohio, Apr.); Thomas T. McAvoy, *Father Badin comes to Notre Dame* (Indiana Mag. of Hist., Mar.); Frank Anderson, *Missouri's Confederate State Capitol at Marshall, Texas* (Missouri Hist. Rev., Apr.); Ethan P. Allen, *Appeals from the Supreme Court of Iowa to the Supreme Court of the United States* (Iowa Jour. of Hist. and Pol., Apr.); Russell H. Anderson, *New York Agriculture Meets the West, 1830–1850* [concl'd] (Wisconsin Mag. of Hist., Mar.); Esther A. Selke, *Pioneers of German Lutheranism in Minnesota* (Minnesota Hist., Mar.); Marvin H. Garfield, *The Indian Question in Congress and in Kansas* (Kansas Hist. Quar., Feb.); M. Aquinata Martin, *Early Catholic Colonization in Nebraska* [II.] (Mid-America, Apr.); LeRoy R. Hafen, *Currency, Coinage, and Banking in Pioneer Colorado* (Colorado Mag., May); Grant Foreman, *A Survey of Tribal Records in the Archives of the United States Government in Oklahoma* (Chron. of Oklahoma, Mar.); Charles S. Walker, *Causes of the Confederate Invasion of New Mexico* (New Mexico Hist. Rev., Apr.); F. S. Donnell, *When Texas owned New Mexico to the Rio Grande* (*ibid.*); Rufus Kay Wyllys, *The Republic of Lower California, 1853–1854* (Pacific Hist. Rev., Mar.); George Verne Blue, *France and the Oregon Question* (Oregon Hist. Quar., Mar.); J. Neilson Barry, *Fort Reed and Fort Boise 1814–1835* (*ibid.*); J. Orin Oliphant, *The Operations in the Oregon Country of the American Bible Society and of the American Tract Society before the Civil War* (Washington Hist. Quar., Apr.); C. S. Kingston, *The Walla Walla Separation Movement* (Washington Hist. Quar., Apr.).

Documents and letters: Thomas F. O'Connor, ed., *Letters of John Grassi, S.J., to Simon Bruté de Rémur, 1812–1832* (Mid-America, Apr.); F. Garvin Davenport, ed., *Judge Sharkey Papers* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., June); *The Diary of Mark S. Davis* [May-June, 1868]: *"By Spring-Wagon to Missouri and Kansas"* (Indiana Mag. of Hist., Mar.); *Across the Plains in a Prarie Schooner: from the Diary of Elizabeth Keyes* [Apr. 11–June 2, 1866] (Colorado Mag., Mar.).

CANADA

The Report of the Public Archives of the Dominion of Canada for 1932, by Arthur G. Doughty, keeper of the records, is principally devoted to Series G of the Public Arch. es, the papers addressed by the secretaries of state for the colonies to the administrators of Lower Canada, this section covering the years 1838–1841.

The Ontario Historical Society has published vol. I. of *The Correspondence of the Honourable Peter Russell* (Toronto, 1932, pp. xxviii, 336) edited by Brigadier-General E. A. Cruikshank, LL.D., and A. F. Hunter, M.A. An introduction explains the circumstances under which Russell became administrator of Upper Canada during the leave of absence of Lieutenant-Governor Simcoe, which began in 1796. This volume covers that and the following year.

Vol. V., 1932, of *Contributions to Canadian Economics* which belongs to the series of Studies in History and Economics published by the University of Toronto, contains the following essays: The Future of Canadian Export Trade in Wheat, by D. A. MacGibbon; Construction of Railways in Canada to the Year 1885, by M. L. Bladen; A Note on the Reports of Public Investigations into Combines in Canada, 1888–1932, by V. W. Bladen. It also includes a Bibliography of Publications on Canadian Economics for June to December, 1931, by M. L. Bladen.

Articles: Donald L. Cherry, *The South Sea Company, 1711–1855* (Dalhousie Rev., Apr.); Norman McL. Rogers, *The Genesis of Provincial Rights* (Can. Hist. Rev., Mar.); J. A. Maxwell, *Prince Edward Island and Confederation* (Dalhousie Rev., Apr.); V. Kenneth Johnston, *Canada's Title to the Arctic Islands* (Can. Hist. Rev., Mar.).

Documents: R. A. Humphreys, S. Morley Scott, eds., *Lord Northington and the Laws of Canada* [text of draft instructions of 1766] (Can. Hist. Rev., Mar.).

CUBA, MEXICO, AND SOUTH AMERICA

On April 1, in New York City, a group of scholars interested in Latin America organized a provisional Committee on Latin-American Research. Professor H. E. Bolton, of the University of California, was made chairman of the executive board of this committee, while Professor Dana G. Munro, of Princeton University, was made secretary. There is a prospect that from this committee an institute on Latin-American affairs may develop.

The Academia de la Historia de Cuba has published vol. I. of the *Papeles de Martí* composed of letters which were exchanged by Martí and General Maximo Gómez accompanied by notes, an introduction, and an appendix by Gonzalo de Quesada y Miranda.

The Mexican government has printed in the Publicaciones del Archivo General de la Nación, La Vida Colonial, *Los Precursores Ideológicos de la Guerra de Independencia,* tomo II., *La Masonería en México, Siglo XVIII.,* and *Los Judíos en la Nueva España: Selección de Documentos del Siglo XVI., correspondiente al Ramo de Inquisición* (Mexico, Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, 1932).

Mrs. Fanny R. Bandelier has translated into English vol. I. of Fray Bernardino de Sagahún's *A History of Ancient Mexico* (Fisk University Social Science Series, Nashville, 1932).

Vol. I., no. 1, of the *Boletín de la Academia Panameña de la Historia* (Panama, Imprenta Nacional, 1933), contains articles on the following topics: the ashes of Columbus, the discovery of the South Sea, the flag of the Isthmus in the Battle of Ayacucho, and José de Obaldía.

Besides inedited letters of Gonzalo Jímenez de Quesada, no. 226 of the *Boletín de Historia y Antigüedades* (Nov., 1932), of the Colombian Academy of History, contains articles on early historians of New Granada and the relations of Colombia with the Holy See.

The World Peace Foundation has published official documents concerning *The Verdict of the League: Colombia and Peru at Leticia,* edited with an introduction and notes by Manley O. Hudson (Boston, 1933).

The Colombian legation at Washington has published (Washington, 1933) a booklet entitled *International Opinion and the Leticia Controversy.*

Vol. I. of *Escritos de Don Pedro Fernández Madrid publicados con Noticias sobre su Vida y su Época,* by Raimundo Rivas, contains material concerning the history of New Granada, 1830–1853 (Bogotá, Editorial Minerva, 1932).

Among other items, no. 38 of the *Boletín de la Biblioteca Nacional* of Venezuela contains an installment of the Diary of Bucaramanga, an article on the *Gazeta de Caracas,* and a letter of the Basque historian Mugártegui concerning the ancestry of Simón Bolívar.

Vol. XIII. of the *Archivo del General Miranda,* which is being published by the Venezuelan government, is mainly composed of letters to Miranda during the French Revolution (Caracas, Editorial Sur-America, 1932).

C. Parra Pérez has published a historical study entitled *El Régimen Español en Venezuela* (Madrid, Morata, 1933).

Professor Sturgis E. Leavitt has published *A Tentative Bibliography of Peruvian Literature* (Harvard University Press, 1932), and also *Hispano-American Literature in the United States, a bibliography of Translations and Criticism* (Harvard University Press, 1932).

Adolfo Laguna has published a treatise entitled *La Diplomacia Paraguaya en la Cuestión del Chaco Boreal* (Buenos Aires, Mercedes, 1932).

Anibal Ponce has published a volume on Argentine history in *Sarmiento, Constructor de la Nueva Argentina,* a number in the series entitled Vidas Españolas y Hispano-Americanas del Siglo XIX. (Madrid, Espanacalpe).

The Diplomatic Protection of Americans in Mexico, by Frederick Sherwood Dunn (Columbia University Press, 1933, pp. x, 439, $5.00) is vol. II. of a series dealing with Mexico prepared under the auspices of the Columbia University Council for Research in the Social Sciences.

Dr. Paul S. Taylor continues his studies of Mexican laborers with a monograph entitled *A Spanish-Mexican Peasant Community: Arandas in Jalisco, Mexico* (University of California Press, 1933, pp. 77, 8 plates and map, $1.50). It is no. 4 of the series Ibero-Americana.

The special tribunal chosen to consider the Guatemala-Honduras boundary has published its findings in both English and Spanish under the title of *Opinion and Award* (Washington, 1933, pp. 99). It is accompanied by two maps. The opinion is signed by Charles Evans Hughes as president of the tribunal.

Articles: Roberto Levillier, *L'Amérique Espagnole: l'Histoire de sa Conquête* (Rev. d'Hist. Mod., Nov.); J. Lloyd Mecham, *The Jefe Político in México* (Southwestern Soc. Sci. Quar., XII. 4); Raymond L. Buell, *Union or Disunion in Central America?* (Foreign Affairs, XI. 3); A. H. Feller, *The German-Mexican Claims Commission* (Am. Jour. Int. Law, XXVII. 1); P. A. Martin, *Slavery and Abolition in Brazil* (Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev., May); C. H. Haring, *The Chilean Revolution of 1931* (*ibid.*); A. K. Manchester, *Descriptive Bibliography of the Brazilian Section of the Duke University Library* (*ibid.*); Jac Nachbin, *Descriptive Calendar of South American Manuscripts* (*ibid.*).

W. S. R.

Contributions to the section of Historical News have been made by T. S. Anderson, A. I. Andrews, F. B. Artz, G. C. Boyce, J. P. Boyd, T. R. S. Broughton, E. C. Burnett, L. J. Cappon, E. N. Curtis, G. M. Dutcher, H. L. Gray, J. E. Haley, R. W. Irwin, J. F. Jameson, Louise P. Kellogg, W. T. Laprade, L. M. Larson, R. F. Nichols, W. S. Robertson, Eva M. Sanford, T. H. Thomas, Janet W. Wiecking.

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Founded in 1884 Chartered by Congress in 1889

Principal Office

40 B STREET, S. W., WASHINGTON, D. C.

MEMBERSHIP, DECEMBER, 1932: Life members, 579; annual members, 2449; institutions, 308; total, 3336. Persons interested in historical studies, whether professionally or otherwise, are invited to membership.

MEETINGS: An annual meeting is held in the last days of each year. The program of papers presented and the business meeting occupy three days. The average attendance exceeds 500.

The Association maintains close relations with the state and local historical societies through conferences in connection with the annual meetings.

The Pacific Coast Branch holds meetings in December on the Pacific Coast. Full membership in the Association is maintained.

PUBLICATIONS: The *Annual Report,* covering the activities of the Association, and a supplementary volume or volumes of importance to students of history are printed by virtue of an appropriation by Congress, and are sent to members who request them.

The *American Historical Review,* surveying the entire field of Ancient, Medieval, and Modern, including American, history, published quarterly, is sent to all members.

PRIZES: The *John H. Dunning Prize,* of $200, is awarded for a work on a subject in the field of American history.

The *George Louis Beer Prize,* of $250, is awarded for the best work upon any phase of European international history since 1895.

The *Jean Jules Jusserand Medal* is offered annually for the best work on intellectual relations between America and one or more European countries.

DUES: The annual dues are $5.00; there is no initiation fee. The fee for life membership, $100, secures exemption from all annual dues.

CORRESPONDENCE: Inquiries respecting the Association should be addressed to the Assistant Secretary at 40 B Street, S. W., Washington, D. C.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BRITISH HISTORY

TUDOR PERIOD, 1485–1603

ISSUED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF
THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF GREAT BRITAIN

Edited by CONYERS READ

This is a companion volume to *Bibliography of British History: Stuart Period*, 1603–1714, edited by Professor Godfrey Davies and published in 1928 (21*s.* net).

Ready shortly, Royal 8vo (10¾ x 6¾), *about 480 pages, price 30s. net.*

OF ALL BOOKSELLERS

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

A volume on the Eighteenth Century (covering the period 1715–1789) is in course of preparation, under the editorship of Professor D. J. Medley.

Two Notable American Dynasties

The Francis Preston Blair Family In Politics

(Vols. I and II)

By WILLIAM E. SMITH

AN elaborate, carefully detailed biography of a family which played a vital role in American political history from 1828 to 1876. With a view to providing adequate background, a parallel account of the national history accompanies the story of the Blairs.

Much of the material included is new, particularly as regards the Jackson Administration, the Free Soil Controversy and the Liberal Republican movement.

$7.50 (set)

Joseph Smith

An American Prophet

By JOHN HENRY EVANS

For a hundred years a controversy has raged over everything Morman, not only in America, but in Europe as well. Of necessity it has centered about the character of Joseph Smith—founder of Mormonism. As a result, the Joseph Smith of the popular imagination is far from the reality. Here the real Joseph Smith rises—a spectacular, strange, and fascinating personality.

The book is in three parts: the prophets career; his religious philosophy, and the prophet's own account of himself and his work, etc.

$4.00

The Macmillan Company

60 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

"A Soldier of The King"

Lord Jeffery Amherst

By J. C. LONG

A SOUND and stimulating biography of the dynamic commander-in-chief of King George III's forces in America prior and during the Revolution—and also the *real* conqueror of Canada.

Jammed with hitherto unpublished facts of Colonial incidents and personages, drawn largely from records found by the author in seventeen large chests stored in the Amherst ancestral home in England. Lord North, Burgoyne, Edmund Burke, the Earl of Chatham and other outstanding figures of the period cross the stage in the affairs of Lord Jeffery and furnish new sidelights on American history.

"It is evident Amherst was one of the men whose actions have been decisive in our history."—Book of The Month News.

At any bookstore

$4.00

The Macmillan Company

60 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

Acclaimed by teachers and the press

The Rise of the City

By ARTHUR MEIER SCHLESINGER

Professor of History, Harvard University

Volume X of

A History of American Life

"The host of problems to which the growth of cities gave rise is reviewed by Professor Schlesinger with a minuteness and a wealth of illustration that make his book not only a unique contribution to the history of the period but also a vivid presentation of the contrasts between the present and a recent past." *New York Times.*

"An admirably informatory book—as readable as one could wish." *Forum.*

"Professor Schlesinger has retrieved this whole generation from obscurity; and through his patient digging in the dust heaps of old contemporary records he has succeeded in restoring the first forms of the American metropolitan community. . . . American scholars have developed a surprisingly expert facility in the handling of social historical material; there is no question that 'The Rise of the City' is the best example of that technique thus far afforded us." *Nation.*

"If this not a truthful representation of American life of the period then it is impossible to make one." *Saturday Review of Literature.*

"A significant addition to a valuable series, written in a lively style by an author who is very skillful in revealing important trends in American development. It is a splendid piece of work and, if possible, raises the high standard set by the volumes that have appeared earlier." *A university teacher of history.*

"The best and most significant volume of the Series to date." *A university teacher of history.*

$4.00

The Macmillan Company

60 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

Now used in over

350

Colleges and Universities

HAYES

A Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe

Volume I

"Seldom have I seen a volume of any sort that gives such an impression of richness."

"Professor Hayes is to be congratulated on preserving the good qualities of his earlier work while adding the results of later scholarship. Use of contemporary pictures and maps is a new and attractive feature. Full treatment of cultural aspects is valuable. A good book made better."

"Professor Hayes' books are invaluable for their full and accurate detail clearly presented and this latest volume is the more welcome because of its exceedingly attractive format."

"Without any question this is the most attractive textbook that has been offered to college students at any time."

$3.50

Apology is here made for the fact that in the last issue of this publication the title of this book was given as "A Political and Cultural History of the United States." While the publishers consider this error most regrettable they rest in the assurance that the readers of this periodical are so familiar with Professor Hayes' work as to have recognized the misnomer immediately.

The Macmillan Company

60 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

Political and Social Growth of the United States

Ready for fall classes

Volume I., 1492-1852

By HOMER C. HOCKETT

Professor of American History, Ohio State University

with

- New introductory material which pictures Europe in the age of colonization, to give the student a sound understanding of America's foundations.
- An ampler presentation of Spanish and French colonial life and institutions.
- Additional matter throughout on social and economic aspects of our national development.
- A new division point, 1852, in conformity with the average American history program for the first semester of work in our colleges which usually closes with a study of the Compromise of 1850 and its immediate effects.
- Up-to-date bibliographies.

Now in preparation

Volume II., 1852-

By ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER

Professor of History, Harvard University

An announcement concerning this book, in which Professor Schlesinger will complete the story of American development to the current year, will be made some time in the near future.

Syllabus

For the first time a syllabus for the study of these volumes, prepared by the authors of the work, will be published under the Macmillan name. The syllabus will be paper-bound, inexpensive, and will appear in two parts as the two volumes of the book are published.

The Macmillan Company

60 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

To be published early in September

COLONIAL HISPANIC AMERICA: A History

By CHARLES EDWARD CHAPMAN

Professor of Hispanic American History in the University of California

THERE has long been a need for a one-volume survey of the early history of Hispanic America. We are, therefore, delighted to announce this volume which gives a broad and somewhat detailed view of those times when the region to the south of the United States was made up of colonies belonging to Spain and Portugal. Professor Chapman describes the origins of the twenty Hispanic American republics. The scope of the story includes the age of discovery (1492 is the starting point), the Hapsburg rule, the Bourbon century, the wars of independence, and the beginning of the republican era.

The work is not intended to be encyclopaedic. It discusses material broadly, with only incidental detail, except as interesting occurrences are adduced to lend color to the account. In addition to its unique subject matter, the particularly readable style, half-tone illustrations, and plentiful maps recommend this book highly, either to the general reader or for text use.

A second volume, dealing with the Republican Era and bringing the story of Hispanic America up to date, is in preparation.

The Macmillan Company

60 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK